arXiv:1611.01496v1 [math.PR] 4 Nov 2016

MULTI-MARTINGALE OPTIMAL TRANSPORT

TONGSEOK LIM

Abstract. Beiglböck-Juillet [5], Beiglböck-Nutz-Touzi [6] showed that the duality is attained in a suitable sense for the martingale optimal transport problem on the real line, that is, when there is one underlying martingale process. We generalize the duality result to the setting of d-underlying martingales which are coupled through a cost functional on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We then exploit the duality to characterize the geometry of the support of the optimal martingale measures. In particular, we show that their conditional distributions are supported on certain extremal sets on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Keywords: Optimal Transport, Martingale, Duality, Copula, Extremal joint distribution.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is threefold: we will define the *multi-martingale optimal transport* (MMOT) problem, then we will establish a duality result which will be the cornerstone for the rest of the paper, and finally we will study the geometry of the solutions of MMOT problem in general dimensions.

The prototype is the *optimal transport* (OT) problem, which is the following: for a given cost function $c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and two Borel probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$, we consider

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \text{cost}[\pi] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x,y)\, d\pi(x,y) \quad \text{over} \quad \pi \in \Pi(\mu,\nu) \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Pi(\mu,\nu)$ is the set of *transport plans*, or *couplings*, that is the set of joint probability measures π on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with given marginals μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Since Gaspard Monge [29] formulated the problem in the 1780's, Kantorovich [24], [25] generalized the Monge problem in 1940's and proposed the above formulation. Since then, many important contributions have been made on the subject and in particular, tremendous effort has been put on establishing a certain characteristic geometry each optimal transport exhibits; see, e.g., [1], [2], [7], [8], [9], [15], [17], [28], [35],[36], [37], [38].

Such a characteristic structure of optimal transport plan is encoded in its support, the so-called *c-cyclical monotonicity*. The monotonicity itself is very useful, but when combined with the celebrated theorem of Rockafellar [32], we obtain the cornerstone of the OT theory, called *duality*, which is the following: there exist two functions $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for every minimizer π of the problem (1.1), we have

$$\varphi(x) + \psi(y) \le c(x,y) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\varphi(x) + \psi(y) = c(x,y) \quad \pi - a.e.\,(x,y). \tag{1.3}$$

Date: November 04, 2016.

The author gratefully acknowledges support from the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) through grant Y782, and also from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement no. 335421.

It turns out that the dual optimizer (φ, ψ) is an essential tool to investigate the optimal transport plans, and for such applications, it is important to derive fine properties of (φ, ψ) (e.g. regularity). It turns out that the *Legendre transform* is the right way to obtain such regularity property.

Recently, a variant of the problem was introduced, the so-called *martingale optimal transport* (MOT) problem, that is the following:

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \text{Cost}[\pi] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x,y)\, d\pi(x,y) \quad \text{over} \quad \pi \in \text{MT}(\mu,\nu) \tag{1.4}$$

where $\text{MT}(\mu,\nu)$ (Martingale Transport plans) is the set of joint probabilities on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ having μ and ν as its marginals, such that for each $\pi \in \text{MT}(\mu,\nu)$, its disintegration $(\pi_x)_x$ with respect to μ must satisfy that for μ - a.e. x,

$$\xi(x) \le \int \xi(y)\, d\pi_x(y) \quad \text{for any convex function } \xi \text{ defined on } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.5}$$

Then we say that the measure π_x has its *barycenter* at x. We can also describe the MOT problem as the following: we consider

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\, c(X,Y) \tag{1.6}$$

over all martingales (X,Y) on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ into $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (i.e. $\mathbb{E}[Y|X] = X$) with prescribed laws $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$.

[34] showed that $\text{MT}(\mu,\nu)$ is nonempty if and only if μ,ν are in *convex order*.

Definition 1.1. *Measures μ, ν are said to be in convex order and written as $\mu \le_c \nu$, if*

(1) they have finite mass and finite first moments,
(2) for convex functions ξ defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\int \xi\, d\mu \le \int \xi\, d\nu$.

We see that the assumption in (1) is minimal for considering MOT problem, so we will assume that every measure appearing in this paper has finite mass and finite first moment. Also, all sets, measures and functions will be assumed (or proved) to be Borel-measurable.

Since D. Hobson recognized the importance of the formulation in the "model-free" approach to finance and asset pricing, much related research has been done in this context, for example, [3], [4], [5], [6], [13], [16], [20], [21], [22], [23]. While in OT problem the objective function $c(x,y)$ mainly represents the transportation cost, in MOT problem it often refers to an option whose realization depends on the underlying asset, that is the martingale (X,Y). Then the integral (1.4) represents the price of the option c with respect to the joint law π of the underlying asset (X,Y).

Since the duality has been the cornerstone for the study of OT problem, we may anticipate that a corresponding duality in MOT theory should be essential as well: we say that a triple of functions (φ, ψ, h), where $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $h : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, is a dual maximizer of the problem (1.4) if for every minimizer π of (1.4) we have

$$\varphi(x) + \psi(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x) \le c(x,y) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.7}$$

$$\varphi(x) + \psi(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x) = c(x,y) \quad \pi - a.e.\,(x,y). \tag{1.8}$$

To attain the duality, as learned in OT theory we expect that a relevant monotonicity should hold for MOT plans and in turn it may induce duality. Indeed, [4] showed that every MOT plan satisfies a certain natural monotonicity property for martingales. However, unlike the OT theory the duality is not attained in MOT in general, even for fairly simple marginals

(μ,ν) and cost $c(x,y)$; see [4], [6], [19] for counterexamples. The seemingly harmless linear term $h(x)\cdot(y-x)$ drastically changes the picture. This is one of the places where the theory of OT and MOT are fundamentally divergent, and the lack of duality makes the study of MOT complex.

Nevertheless, [5], [6] showed that in dimension one ($d=1$), duality is attained under the additional assumption on (μ,ν) than the convex order, called *irreducibility* (this is also where the OT and MOT are divergent: in OT theory essentially no relation between μ,ν is required for duality). The irreducibility of (μ,ν) is characterized by their *potential functions*

$$u_\mu(x) := \int |x-y|\,d\mu(y), \quad u_\nu(x) := \int |x-y|\,d\nu(y)$$

as follows: the following definition is stated in [6].

Definition 1.2. *The pair $\mu \leq_c \nu$ is irreducible if the set $I = \{u_\mu < u_\nu\}$ is connected and $\mu(I) = \mu(\mathbb{R})$. In this situation, let J be the union of I and any endpoints of I that are atoms of ν; then (I,J) is the domain of (μ,ν).*

The open interval I is the interior of convex hull of support of ν, and J is the minimal superset of I supporting ν. In other words if we write $I =]a,b[$, then $J =]a,b[$ if $\nu(a)=\nu(b)=0$, $J=[a,b[$ if $\nu(a)>0$ and $\nu(b)=0$, $J=]a,b]$ if $\nu(a)=0$ and $\nu(b)>0$, and finally $J=[a,b]$ if $\nu(a)>0$ and $\nu(b)>0$. For more on potential and irreducibility, see [5], [6].

As recognized by [5], [6], the notion of irreducibility is indispensable for duality. Unfortunately, in higher dimension ($d\geq 2$) a natural definition of irreducibility between μ,ν has not been found and, as recognized in [19], indeed the study of duality turns out to be surprisingly deep and complex. One of the reasons why such complexity comes in is linked to the existence of Nikodym sets; see [1], [19]. Nevertheless, [19] finds a certain canonical decomposition of each optimizer π of the problem (1.4), and establishes the fact that each component of π now admits duality even if the whole π may not. Then as one of the various applications of the the partial duality result, [19] establishes the following theorem:

[19, **Theorem 8.3.**] *Assume $d=2$, $c(x,y)=\pm|x-y|$, $\mu\leq_c\nu$ and $\mu\wedge\nu=0$, μ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and ν has compact support. Let $\pi\in \mathrm{MT}(\mu,\nu)$ be a solution of (1.4) and $(\pi_x)_x$ be a disintegration of π with respect to μ. Then for μ - a.e. $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$ the support of π_x coincides with the extreme points of the closed convex hull of itself, that is*

$$\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right).$$

One may wonder why the theorem holds only in $d=2$. What about in $d\geq 3$? [19] establishes the theorem in $d\geq 3$ under various additional assumptions on the target measure ν, but in general, only under the assumption $\mu << \mathcal{L}^d$ the theorem is not readily established, since in $d\geq 3$ this problem is again deeply connected to the existence of Nikodym sets.

Now we define the *multi-martingale optimal transport* (MMOT) problem, the main subject of this paper: Let (μ_i,ν_i), $1\leq i\leq d$, be probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ which are in convex order, and let (X_i,Y_i) be one-step martingales (i.e. $\mathbb{E}(Y_i|X_i)=X_i$) with the prescribed marginal laws $X_i\sim\mu_i$ and $Y_i\sim\nu_i$. Let $\mu=(\mu_1,...,\mu_d)$, $\nu=(\nu_1,...,\nu_d)$. Then we consider

$$\text{Minimize}\quad \mathrm{Cost}[\pi] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} c(x,y)\,d\pi(x,y) \quad \text{over} \quad \pi\in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu) \tag{1.9}$$

where $\mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$ (Multi-Martingale Transport) is the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ such that each $\pi\in\mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$ is the joint law of martingales $(X_i,Y_i)_{i\le d}$ having $(\mu_i,\nu_i)_{i\le d}$ as its marginals, respectively.

One may describe the MMOT problem in the following way: we consider

$$\text{Minimize}\quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\, c(X,Y) \tag{1.10}$$

over all martingales (X,Y) on a probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ into $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ (i.e. $\mathbb{E}[Y|X]=X$), where $X=(X_i)_{i\le d}$ and $Y=(Y_i)_{i\le d}$, with prescribed marginal laws $X_i\sim\mu_i$ and $Y_i\sim\nu_i$. Then we will say that $\pi^1=\mathrm{Law}(X)$ and $\pi^2=\mathrm{Law}(Y)$ are the first and second *copula* of $\pi=\mathrm{Law}(X,Y)$, respectively. Note that then π^1 and π^2 have marginals $\mu_1,...,\mu_d$ and $\nu_1,...,\nu_d$ respectively.

To the best of the author's knowledge, this formulation has been introduced and studied in this paper for the first time. Notice that the difference between MOT and MMOT problem lies in the constraint: in MOT problem it is the law of X and the law of Y (i.e. the copulas) which are assumed to be known. On the other hand, in MMOT problem the individual laws of $X_1,....,X_d$ and $Y_1,...,Y_d$ (that is, $\mu_1,...,\mu_d$ and $\nu_1,...,\nu_d$) are known.

The MMOT problem may find one of its motivations in Finance. Again one can interpret the function $c(X,Y)$ as an option which simultaneously depends on many underlying assets $(X_i,Y_i)_{i\le d}$, and one can interpret the value $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\,c(X,Y)$ as the option price with respect to the joint law $\mathbb{P}$ of $(X_i,Y_i)_{i\le d}$. Now the knowledge of the prescribed marginal laws $(\mu_i,\nu_i)_{i\le d}$ is justified by the fact that these can be determined by observing prices of various European options in the financial market. The fact that many traded options in the market indeed depend on many underlying assets may highlight the importance of the study of MMOT problem, and especially the study of duality, since duality can be interpreted as the optimal subhedging opportunity in finance.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we illustrate the main results of the paper. In Section 3 we establish the duality. In Section 4 we prove the uniform boundedness of a certain class of convex functions, which plays a crucial role in establishing the duality. In Section 5 we explain how the Legendre transform (see [38]) and martingale Legendre transform (see [19]) are combined in MMOT theory, and as a result we see that how the copulas solve the Kantorovich dual problem. Finally, in Section 6 we study the geometry of the solutions of MMOT when the cost is $c(x,y)=||x-y||$, where $||\cdot||$ is a strictly convex norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$, thereby establishing an analogous result as in [19, **Theorem 8.3**]. Remarkably, while [19, **Theorem 8.3**] holds in its full generality in dimension two, our result holds in every dimension.

2. Main results

Let $(d)=\{1,2,...,d\}$. The first main result is the following attainment of duality.

Theorem 2.1. *Let (μ_i,ν_i) be an irreducible pair of probability measures with domain (I_i,J_i) for each $i\in(d)$. Let $c(x,y)=c(x_1,...,x_d,y_1,...,y_d)$ be a cost function. Assume that*

$$P(c):=\min_{\pi\in\mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} c(x,y)\,d\pi(x,y)\quad \textit{is finite.}$$

Suppose that for each $i\in(d)$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$, there exist real-valued functions $f_{i,n}\in L^1(\mu_i)$, $g_{i,n}\in L^1(\nu_i)$, and $h_{i,n}$ which is bounded μ_j-a.e. x_j for every $j\in(d)$, such that the following

weak duality holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d}\big(f_{i,n}(x_i)-g_{i,n}(y_i)+h_{i,n}(x_1,...,x_d)\cdot(y_i-x_i)\big)\le c(x_1,...,x_d,y_1,...,y_d), \tag{2.1}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d}\Big(\int f_{i,n}d\mu_i-\int g_{i,n}d\nu_i\Big)\nearrow P(c)\quad as\quad n\to\infty. \tag{2.2}$$

Let $I=I_1\times...\times I_d$, $J=J_1\times...\times J_d$. Assume that there exists a function q such that

$$\sup_{x\in I}c(x,y)\le q(y)\quad\forall y\in J\quad and\quad q\in L^1(\rho)\quad for\ any\quad \rho\in\Pi(\nu_1,...,\nu_d) \tag{2.3}$$

where $\Pi(\nu_1,...,\nu_d)$ denotes the set of all couplings of $\nu_1,...,\nu_d$. Then we can find a weak dual maximizer, that is a sequence of functions $(\tilde f_{i,n},\tilde g_{i,n},\tilde h_{i,n})_n$ such that the weak duality (2.1), (2.2) *still holds with it, and furthermore:*

(1) there exist functions f_i,g_i for each $i\in(d)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\tilde f_{i,n}(x_i)=f_i(x_i)\in\mathbb{R}\quad\mu_i-a.e.\,x_i,\quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\tilde g_{i,n}(y_i)=g_i(y_i)\in\mathbb{R}\quad\nu_i-a.e.\,y_i, \tag{2.4}$$

(2) there exist functions $(h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ defined and finite for μ_j-a.e. x_j for every $j\in(d)$, such that

$$\sum_{i\in(d)}\big(f_i(x_i)-g_i(y_i)+h_i(x_1,...,x_d)\cdot(y_i-x_i)\big)\le c(x,y)\quad\mu_i-a.e.\,x_i,\ \nu_i-a.e.\,y_i, \tag{2.5}$$

and whenever functions $(h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ satisfy (2.5)*, for any minimizer $\pi\in\mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$*

$$\sum_{i\in(d)}\big(f_i(x_i)-g_i(y_i)+h_i(x_1,...,x_d)\cdot(y_i-x_i)\big)=c(x,y)\quad\pi-a.e.\,(x,y). \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 2.2. One notices that, compared to the duality formulation for MOT problem, the functions $\varphi(x)$, $\psi(y)$ in (1.7), (1.8) are now decoupled as $\big(f_i(x_i)\big)_{i\in(d)}$, $\big(g_i(y_i)\big)_{i\in(d)}$ in (2.5), (2.6), where $x=(x_i)_{i\in(d)}$, $y=(y_i)_{i\in(d)}$. On the other hand, the "trading strategy" h still depends on every $x_1,...,x_d$. One may interpret this as follows: when an option holder wants to hedge her risk, she can decide the number of assets in her portfolio depending on the information of all initial asset values $X_1,...,X_d$. The multi-dependence of $h_i(x)$ and $c(x,y)$ makes the study of MMOT problem genuinely different than the one-dimensional MOT.

Remark 2.3. One may notice that in establishing the convergence (2.4) there is an immediate obstacle, that is, in the duality formulation (2.1) we could always replace $(f_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$ by $(f_{i,n}+C_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$ for any constants $(C_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$ satisfying $\sum_i C_{i,n}=0$ and similarly replace $(g_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$ by $(g_{i,n}+D_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$. However, we shall see that by careful choice of $(C_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$ and $(D_{i,n})_{i\in(d)}$ and a choice of subsequence, one can obtain the convergence (2.4).

Remark 2.4. We will say that a triple $(f_i,g_i,h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ is a dual solution of the problem (1.9) if it satisfies (2.5) and (2.6). Now Theorem 2.1 might be summarized as: the problem (1.9) admits a dual solution when the marginal pair (μ_i,ν_i) is irreducible for every $i\in(d)$, since under fairly general assumptions the weak dual maximizer exists; e.g. if $c(x,y)$ is lower semi-continuous and there exist $v_i\in L^1(\mu_i)$, $w_i\in L^1(\nu_i)$ for each $i\in(d)$ such that $|c(x,y)|\le\sum_i\big(v_i(x_i)+w_i(y_i)\big)$ (in particular any lower semi-continuous cost having linear growth at infinity), then there exists $(f_{i,n},g_{i,n},h_{i,n})_n$ where $f_{i,n},g_{i,n},h_{i,n}$ are continuous and bounded such that (2.1), (2.2) holds. Nevertheless this condition on the cost for the existence of weak dual maximizer is not minimal. Also, the assumption (2.3) holds in general circumstances, for example, if ν_i's are compactly supported and $c(x,y)$ is locally bounded.

As we shall see in the proof of Theorem 2.1, the following theorem on the uniform boundedness of certain convex functions is a crucial ingredient. To describe the theorem, recall $I = I_1 \times ... \times I_d$, $J = J_1 \times ... \times J_d$ and let $\mu^{\otimes} = \mu_1 \otimes ... \otimes \mu_d$, $\nu^{\otimes} = \nu_1 \otimes ... \otimes \nu_d$. Let $\{\varepsilon_k\}_k$ be a sequence of positive decreasing sequence tending to zero as $k \to \infty$, and write $I_i =]a_i, b_i[$. Either a_i can be $-\infty$ or b_i be $+\infty$. Then we define the compact interval $J_{i,k} := [c_{i,k}, d_{i,k}]$ for $i \in (d)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as:

$$\nu_i(a_i) = 0 \Rightarrow c_{i,k} := a_i + \varepsilon_k, \quad \nu_i(a_i) > 0 \Rightarrow c_{i,k} := a_i, \quad a_i = -\infty \Rightarrow c_{i,k} := -1/\varepsilon_k. \tag{2.7}$$

$$\nu_i(b_i) = 0 \Rightarrow d_{i,k} := b_i - \varepsilon_k, \quad \nu_i(b_i) > 0 \Rightarrow d_{i,k} := b_i, \quad b_i = +\infty \Rightarrow d_{i,k} := +1/\varepsilon_k. \tag{2.8}$$

We assume that ε_1 is small enough so that $\mu_i(J_{i,1}) > 0$, $\nu_i(J_{i,1}) > 0$ for every $i \in (d)$. Notice that $J_{i,k} \nearrow J_i$. Let $J_k := J_{1,k} \times J_{2,k} \times ... \times J_{d,k}$. Now we can describe the theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $a \in I$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $(\mu_i, \nu_i)_{i\in(d)}$ be irreducible pairs of probability measures with domain (I_i, J_i). Consider the following class of functions $\Lambda = \Lambda(a, C, \mu_i, \nu_i)$ where every $\chi \in \Lambda$ satisfies the following:*

(1) χ is a real-valued convex function on J,
(2) $\chi(a) = \nabla\chi(a) = 0$, that is 0 belongs to the subdifferential of χ at a,
(3) $\int \chi \, d(\nu^{\otimes} - \mu^{\otimes}) \leq C$.

Then we have:

(1) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $M_k \geq 0$ such that $\chi \leq M_k$ on J_k for every $\chi \in \Lambda$,
(2) for any sequence $\{\chi_n\}_n$ in Λ, there exists a subsequence $\{\chi_{n_j}\}_j$ of $\{\chi_n\}_n$ and a real-valued convex function χ on J such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} \chi_{n_j}(x) = \chi(x)$ for every $x \in J$, and furthermore the convergence is uniform on every compact subset of I.

We note that while the one-dimensional version of this theorem was proved in [6], we will devise a new proof in order to extend the theorem in general dimensions as stated.

Now suppose that a triple $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ is a dual solution of the problem (1.9). In order to study the geometry of the solutions of MMOT, some regularity of the dual $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ is desired. Inspired by [17], [19], in section 4 we shall see that various transforms can be applied on the triple $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$, and as a consequence, we show the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose that a triple $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ is a dual solution of the problem (1.9), i.e. $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ satisfies (2.5) and (2.6). Let $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu, \nu)$ be any minimizer for (1.9). Then its first and second copulas π^1, π^2 (i.e. $\pi^1 = \mathrm{Law}(X)$, $\pi^2 = \mathrm{Law}(Y)$ when $\pi = \mathrm{Law}(X, Y)$) solve the dual optimal transport problem with respect to the costs α, β respectively, in the following sense:*

$$\sum_i f_i(x_i) \leq \alpha(x) \quad \mu_i - a.e.\, x_i \ \text{ for every } \ i \in (d), \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i f_i(x_i) = \alpha(x) \quad \pi^1 - a.e.\, x,$$

$$\sum_i g_i(y_i) \geq \beta(y) \quad \nu_i - a.e.\, y_i \ \text{ for every } \ i \in (d), \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i g_i(y_i) = \beta(y) \quad \pi^2 - a.e.\, y.$$

Here $\alpha : I \to \mathbb{R}$, $\beta : J \to \mathbb{R}$ are defined in terms of the function $\sum_i g_i(y_i)$ and called the martingale Legendre transform and its inverse transform in [19]. Moreover, we shall see that the dual solution $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ can be replaced by a better solution $(\varphi_i, \psi_i, \gamma_i)_{i\in(d)}$ in terms of regularity; see section 4 for the definitions. For more on the copula theory, we refer to [14], [18], [31], [33].

Finally, in section 5 we prove the second main result of the paper, which is the following theorem. Notice that the irreducibility assumption on $(\mu_i, \nu_i)_{i\in(d)}$ is not assumed, and there is no restriction on the dimension d.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $(\mu_i, \nu_i)_{i\in(d)}$ be pairs of compactly supported probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ which are in convex order, and suppose that μ_i is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure for every $i \in (d)$. Let $c(x, y) = \pm||x - y||$ where the norm $||\cdot||$ is strictly convex and $x \mapsto ||x||$ is differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$. Let π be any minimizer for the problem (1.9). Then:*

(1) if $c(x, y) = -||x - y||$, then for any disintegration $(\pi_x)_x$ of π with respect to the first copula π^1, the support of π_x coincides with the extreme points of the closed convex hull of itself, that is

$$\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right), \quad \pi^1 - a.e.\, x.$$

(2) if $c(x, y) = ||x - y||$, then the common copula $\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2$ stays put under π in the sense that if we define $D : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by $D(x) = (x, x)$, then the push-forward measure of $\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2$ by the map D is dominated by π, i.e. $D_\#(\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2) \leq \pi$. Let $\tilde{\pi} = \pi - D_\#(\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2)$ and let $(\tilde{\pi}_x)_x$ be its disintegration with respect to the first copula $\tilde{\pi}^1$. Then

$$\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\pi}_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\pi}_x)\right), \quad \tilde{\pi}^1 - a.e.\, x.$$

Hence, either $\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right)$ or $\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right) \cup \{x\}$.

One may compare this result with, e.g. [5, Theorem 7.3, Theorem 7.4].

3. Duality

In this section we will prove Theorem 2.1, assuming that Theorem 2.5 is valid. Theorem 2.5 will be proved in the next section. We restate Theorem 2.1 for convenience:

Theorem 3.1. *Let (μ_i, ν_i) be an irreducible pair of probability measures with domain (I_i, J_i) for each $i \in (d)$. Let $c(x, y) = c(x_1, ..., x_d, y_1, ..., y_d)$ be a cost function. Assume that*

$$P(c) := \min_{\pi\in\mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y)\, d\pi(x, y) \quad \text{is finite.}$$

Suppose that for each $i \in (d)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist real-valued functions $f_{i,n} \in L^1(\mu_i)$, $g_{i,n} \in L^1(\nu_i)$, and $h_{i,n}$ which is bounded μ_j-a.e. x_j for every $j \in (d)$, such that the following weak duality holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(f_{i,n}(x_i) - g_{i,n}(y_i) + h_{i,n}(x_1, ..., x_d) \cdot (y_i - x_i)\right) \leq c(x_1, ..., x_d, y_1, ..., y_d), \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \Big(\int f_{i,n} d\mu_i - \int g_{i,n} d\nu_i \Big) \nearrow P(c) \quad as \quad n \to \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

Assume that there exists a function q such that

$$\sup_{x\in I} c(x, y) \leq q(y) \quad \forall y \in J \quad and \quad q \in L^1(\rho) \quad for\ any \quad \rho \in \Pi(\nu_1, ..., \nu_d) \tag{3.3}$$

where $\Pi(\nu_1, ..., \nu_d)$ denotes the set of all couplings of $\nu_1, ..., \nu_d$. Then we can find a weak dual maximizer, that is a sequence of functions $(\tilde{f}_{i,n}, \tilde{g}_{i,n}, \tilde{h}_{i,n})_n$ such that the weak duality (3.1), (3.2) still holds with it, and furthermore:

(1) there exist functions f_i, g_i for each $i \in (d)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{f}_{i,n}(x_i) = f_i(x_i) \in \mathbb{R} \quad \mu_i - a.e.\, x_i, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{g}_{i,n}(y_i) = g_i(y_i) \in \mathbb{R} \quad \nu_i - a.e.\, y_i, \tag{3.4}$$

(2) there exist functions $(h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ defined and finite for μ_j-a.e. x_j for every $j \in (d)$, such that

$$\sum_{i\in(d)} \big(f_i(x_i) - g_i(y_i) + h_i(x_1, ..., x_d)\cdot(y_i - x_i)\big) \le c(x,y) \quad \mu_i - a.e.\, x_i,\ \nu_i - a.e.\, y_i, \tag{3.5}$$

and whenever functions $(h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ satisfy (3.5)*, for any minimizer $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$*

$$\sum_{i\in(d)} \big(f_i(x_i) - g_i(y_i) + h_i(x_1, ..., x_d)\cdot(y_i - x_i)\big) = c(x,y) \quad \pi - a.e.\,(x,y). \tag{3.6}$$

Before beginning the proof of Theorem 3.1, we list a few notation:

- $(d) = \{1, 2, ..., d\}, \quad x = (x_1, ..., x_d), \quad y = (y_1, ..., y_d),$
- $f_n^{\oplus}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d f_{i,n}(x_i), \quad g_n^{\oplus}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^d g_{i,n}(y_i), \quad h_n(x) = \big(h_{1,n}(x), ..., h_{d,n}(x)\big),$
- $\mu^{\otimes} = \mu_1 \otimes ... \otimes \mu_d, \quad \nu^{\otimes} = \nu_1 \otimes ... \otimes \nu_d, \quad I = I_1 \times ... \times I_d, \quad J = J_1 \times ... \times J_d.$

Throughout the proof, the bounding constant C will vary but it will not depend on n.

Proof. **Step 1.** By taking supremum on $x \in I$ in (3.1), we get

$$\chi_n(y) \le \tilde{c}(y) + g_n^{\oplus}(y), \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{c}(y) := \sup_{x\in I} c(x,y), \quad \text{and} \tag{3.7}$$

$$\chi_n(y) := \sup_{x\in I} \big(f_n^{\oplus}(x) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big). \tag{3.8}$$

Note that χ_n is a convex function on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and by definition of χ_n we see that

$$f_n^{\oplus}(y) \le \chi_n(y) \le q(y) + g_n^{\oplus}(y) \quad \forall y \in J,\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.9}$$

Let $a \in I$ be fixed. By subtracting an appropriate linear function $L_n(y) = \nabla L_n(x)\cdot(y-x) + L_n(x)$ to (3.1), that is, by replacing $f_n^{\oplus}(x)$ with $f_n^{\oplus}(x) - L_n(x)$, $g_n^{\oplus}(y)$ with $g_n^{\oplus}(y) - L_n(y)$ and $h_n(x)$ with $h_n(x) - \nabla L_n(x)$, we can assume

$$\chi_n(a) = \nabla\chi_n(a) = 0 \quad \forall n. \tag{3.10}$$

By the weak duality (3.2) and $q \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes})$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int \chi_n \, d(\nu^{\otimes} - \mu^{\otimes}) \le C \quad \forall n. \tag{3.11}$$

Let $J_k \subseteq J$ be defined as in (2.7), (2.8). Then by Theorem 2.5, there exist $\{M_k\}_k$ such that

$$0 \le \sup_n \chi_n \le M_k \quad \text{on} \quad J_k. \tag{3.12}$$

Step 2. We will show the pointwise convergence of (suitably selected and modified) $\{f_{i,n}\}$ and $\{g_{i,n}\}$ as claimed in the theorem. Observe that by (3.2), (3.3) and (3.9),

$$C \geq \int (q + g_n^{\oplus}) d\nu^{\otimes} - \int f_n^{\oplus} d\mu^{\otimes} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\geq \int \chi_n d\nu^{\otimes} - \int f_n^{\oplus} d\mu^{\otimes} \tag{3.14}$$

$$\geq \int \chi_n d\mu^{\otimes} - \int f_n^{\oplus} d\mu^{\otimes} \quad \text{(by convexity of } \chi_n) \tag{3.15}$$

$$= \| \chi_n - f_n^{\oplus} \|_{L^1(\mu^{\otimes})} \quad \forall n. \tag{3.16}$$

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mu_{i,k}$ be the restriction of μ_i on $J_{i,k}$ then normalized to be a probability measure, and let $\mu_k^{\otimes} = \otimes_i \mu_{i,k}$. Note that $\mu_k^{\otimes}(J_k) = 1$. Define

$$v_{i,k,n} = \int f_{i,n} \, d\mu_{i,k}, \quad i \in (d), k \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that

$$\sup_n \| f_{i,n} - v_{i,k,n} \|_{L^1(\mu_{i,k})} \text{ is bounded for each } i \in (d).$$

To see this, recall that $\sup_n \| \chi_n - f_n^{\oplus} \|_{L^1(\mu_k^{\otimes})}$ is bounded and so by (3.12),

$$C \geq \sup_n \| M_k - f_n^{\oplus} \|_{L^1(\mu_k^{\otimes})} .$$

The constant C may depend on k but not on n. From this, it is clear that

$$C \geq \sup_n |v_{1,k,n} + v_{2,k,n} + ... + v_{d,k,n}|. \tag{3.17}$$

Next, note that as $f_n^{\oplus} \leq M_k$ on J_k, by taking supremum we see that for every n

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sup_{x_i \in J_{i,k}} f_{i,n}(x_i) \leq M_k,$$

and note that obviously $v_{i,k,n} \leq \sup_{x_i \in J_{i,k}} f_{i,n}(x_i)$, so in particular

$$\sup_{x_1 \in J_{1,k}} f_{1,n}(x_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{d} v_{i,k,n} \leq M_k.$$

Define $\hat{v}_{1,k,n} = -\sum_{i=2}^{d} v_{i,k,n}$ and observe

$$C \geq \| M_k - f_n^{\oplus} \|_{L^1(\mu_k^{\otimes})} = M_k - \int (f_{1,n} + \sum_{i=2}^{d} v_{i,k,n}) d\mu_{1,k}.$$

This implies that $\sup_n \| f_{1,n} - \hat{v}_{1,k,n} \|_{L^1(\mu_{1,k})}$ is bounded, and then by (3.17), $\sup_n \| f_{1,n} - v_{1,k,n} \|_{L^1(\mu_{1,k})}$ is bounded. The claim is proved.

Now we are ready to apply the Komlós lemma. Recall $\hat{v}_{1,k,n} = -\sum_{i=2}^{d} v_{i,k,n}$ and define $\tilde{f}_{i,k,n}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n} f_{i,k,m}(x)$, $\tilde{v}_{1,k,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \hat{v}_{1,k,m}$, $\tilde{v}_{i,k,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n} v_{i,k,m}$ for $2 \leq i \leq d$. Observe that by repeated use of Komlós lemma, for every $i \in (d)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find a subsequence $\{f_{i,k,n}\}_n$ of $\{f_{i,n}\}_n$ such that

(1) $\{f_{i,k+1,n}\}_n$ is a susequence of $\{f_{i,k,n}\}_n$, and
(2) $\tilde{f}_{i,k,n}(x_i) - \tilde{v}_{i,k,n}$ converges for $\mu_{i,k}$ - a.e. x_i as $n \to \infty$.

Select the diagonal sequence $F_{i,n} := f_{i,n,n}$ and again define $w_{i,k,n} = \int F_{i,n} d\mu_{i,k}$ for $2 \le i \le d$, $\hat{w}_{1,k,n} = -\sum_{i=2}^{d} w_{i,k,n}$, and define $\tilde{F}_{i,n}(x_i) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{m=1}^{n} F_{i,m}(x_i)$, $\tilde{w}_{1,k,n} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{m=1}^{n} \hat{w}_{1,k,m}$, $\tilde{w}_{i,k,n} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{m=1}^{n} w_{i,k,m}$ for $2 \le i \le d$. We finally claim that

$$\tilde{F}_{i,n}(x_i) - \tilde{w}_{i,1,n} \quad \text{converges for} \quad \mu_i - a.e.\, x_i \quad \text{for every } i \in (d). \tag{3.18}$$

The point is that the dependence on k has now been removed. To see this, as $\{F_{i,n}\}_n$ is a subsequence of $\{f_{i,k,n}\}_n$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by Komlós lemma

$$\tilde{F}_{i,n}(x_i) - \tilde{w}_{i,k,n} \quad \text{converges for} \quad \mu_{i,k} - a.e.\, x_i \quad \text{for every } i \in (d). \tag{3.19}$$

In particular, both $\{\tilde{F}_{i,n}(x_i) - \tilde{w}_{i,1,n}\}_n$ and $\{\tilde{F}_{i,n}(x_i) - \tilde{w}_{i,k,n}\}_n$ converge for $\mu_{i,1}$ - a.e. x_i as $n \to \infty$, hence their difference $\{\tilde{w}_{i,1,n} - \tilde{w}_{i,k,n}\}_n$ must converge for any fixed k. With (3.19) this implies (3.18). Now having a weak maximizer $(F_{i,n}, G_{i,n}, H_{i,n})_n$ at hand where G, H followed the same subsequence as F did, we repeat the same procedure for $G_{i,n}$ by starting from the inequality $C \ge \| \ (q + G_n^{\oplus}) - \chi_n \ \|_{L^1(\nu^{\otimes})}$ so that we get a further subsequence for which similar statement as in (3.18) holds for $G_{i,n}$ as well. Then a final application of Komlós lemma provides a weak maximizer which satisfies the first assertion of the theorem.

Step 3. We have shown that there exists a sequence of functions $(f_{i,n}, g_{i,n}, h_n)_n$ satisfying (3.1), (3.2) for each n, and the limit functions (f_i, g_i) such that as $n \to \infty$, $f_{i,n}(x_i) \to f_i(x_i)$ for μ_i - a.e. x_i and $g_{i,n}(y_i) \to g_i(y_i)$ for ν_i - a.e. y_i. For convenience, let A_i and B_i be the set of convergence points, that is $\mu_i(A_i) = 1$, $\nu_i(B_i) = 1$, and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f_{i,n}(x_i) = f_i(x_i), \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} g_{i,n}(y_i) = g_i(y_i) \quad \text{for any} \quad x_i \in A_i,\, y_i \in B_i.$$

Let $A = A_1 \times ... \times A_d$, $B = B_1 \times ... \times B_d$. Note that $A \subseteq I$, $B \subseteq J$, and moreover the interior of the convex hull of B is I, i.e. $\mathrm{int}(\mathrm{conv}(B)) = I$.

We will show the convergence of $\{\chi_n\}_n$ which is defined by (3.8). Fix $a \in A$ so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n^{\oplus}(a) = f^{\oplus}(a)$. Then as $\mathrm{int}(\mathrm{conv}(B)) = I$ we can find finitely many points in B, say $\{y_1, ..., y_m\}$ so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} g_n^{\oplus}(y_j) = g^{\oplus}(y_j)$ for every $1 \le j \le m$ and $a \in \mathrm{int}(\mathrm{conv}(\{y_1, ..., y_m\}))$. Then in view of (3.9) we see that both $\{\chi_n(a)\}_n$ and $\{\nabla\chi_n(a)\}_n$ are uniformly bounded in n, where $\nabla\chi_n(a) \in \partial\chi_n(a)$ is a subgradient of convex function χ_n at a. Hence by taking a subsequence, we can assume that $\{\chi_n(a)\}_n$ and $\{\nabla\chi_n(a)\}_n$ both converge. Now define an affine function $L_n(y) = \chi_n(a) + \nabla\chi_n(a) \cdot (y - a)$ and replace $f_n^{\oplus}(x)$ with $f_n^{\oplus}(x) - L_n(x)$, $g_n^{\oplus}(y)$ with $g_n^{\oplus}(y) - L_n(y)$ and $h_n(x)$ with $h_n(x) - \nabla\chi_n(a)$. Then we see that $\chi_n(a) = \nabla\chi_n(a) = 0$ while the convergence property of $f_{i,n}, g_{i,n}$ is retained. Then by application of Theorem 2.5, we have $\chi_n \to \chi$ everywhere on J as $n \to \infty$.

Step 4. We will show that there exists a function $h : A \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\sum_{i\in(d)} \big(f_i(x_i) - g_i(y_i)\big) + h(x) \cdot (y - x) \le c(x, y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in A,\, y \in B. \tag{3.20}$$

We will see that such an h can be chosen as follows: For a given function g defined on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mathrm{conv}[g] : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be the convex envelope of g. Now define

$$H(x, y) := \mathrm{conv}[c(x, \cdot) + g^{\oplus}(\cdot)](y).$$

Then any measurable choice h satisfying $h(x) \in \partial H(x, \cdot)(x)$ will satisfy (3.20).

To see this, we can argue as in the proof of [6, Proposition 5.2]. Recall

$$f_n^{\oplus}(x) + h_n(x) \cdot (y - x) \le c(x, y) + g_n^{\oplus}(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in A,\, y \in B, \tag{3.21}$$

we observe that if we define

$$H_n(x,y) := \mathrm{conv}[c(x,\cdot) + g_n^{\oplus}(\cdot)](y)$$

then we have

$$f_n^{\oplus}(x) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x) \le H_n(x,y) \le c(x,y) + g_n^{\oplus}(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x\in A,\, y\in B. \tag{3.22}$$

In particular, by taking $y = x$ in the first inequality, we see that

$$f_n^{\oplus}(x) \le H_n(x,x) \quad \text{for all} \quad x\in A.$$

Next, observe that since lim sup of convex functions is convex, we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} H_n(x,y) \le \mathrm{conv}[\limsup_{n\to\infty}\big(c(x,\cdot)+g_n^{\oplus}(\cdot)\big)](y) = \mathrm{conv}[c(x,\cdot)+g^{\oplus}(\cdot)](y) = H(x,y).$$

Then by the convergence of $f_n^{\oplus}\to f$ and the definition of $H(x,y)$, we have

$$f(x)\le H(x,x) \quad \text{for all} \quad x\in A, \quad \text{and} \quad H(x,y)\le c(x,y)+g^{\oplus}(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x\in A,\, y\in B.$$

In particular, as $\mathrm{int}(\mathrm{conv}(B)) = I$ we see that for each $x\in A$ the convex function $y\mapsto H(x,y)$ is continuous in I, thus the subdifferential $\partial H(x,\cdot)(y)$ is nonempty, convex and compact for every $y\in I$. Hence we can choose a measurable function $h: A\to\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $h(x)\in\partial H(x,\cdot)(x)$ for each $x\in A$. For any such choice, we get (3.20) as follows:

$$f^{\oplus}(x)+h(x)\cdot(y-x)\le H(x,x)+h(x)\cdot(y-x)\le H(x,y)\le c(x,y)+g^{\oplus}(y) \quad \forall x\in A,\,\forall y\in B.$$

Step 5. We will show that for any function $h: A\to\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$f^{\oplus}(x) - g^{\oplus}(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x) \le c(x,y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x\in A,\, y\in B \tag{3.23}$$

(we know such a function exists by Step 4), and for any minimizer π for the problem (1.9), in fact we have

$$f^{\oplus}(x) - g^{\oplus}(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x) = c(x,y), \quad \pi-a.s. \tag{3.24}$$

In other words, every minimizer π is concentrated on the contact set

$$\Gamma := \{(x,y)\,|\, f^{\oplus}(x) - g^{\oplus}(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x) = c(x,y)\}$$

whenever h is chosen to satisfy (3.23).

To begin, recall $f_{i,n}\to f_i$ on A_i, $g_{i,n}\to g_i$ on B_i, and $\chi_n\to\chi$ on J. Now for any $\pi\in\mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$ (not necessarily an optimizer) satisfying $c(x,y)\in L^1(\pi)$, we claim:

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\int \big(f_n^{\oplus}(x) - g_n^{\oplus}(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)d\pi \\ \le \int \big(f^{\oplus}(x) - g^{\oplus}(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)d\pi.\end{aligned}$$

First, let us observe how the claim implies (3.24). Let π^* be any minimizer for (1.9). Then $c(x,y)\in L^1(\pi^*)$ by assumption and $P(c) := \int c(x,y)\,d\pi^*$. Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned}P(c) &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\int \big(f_n^{\oplus}(x) - g_n^{\oplus}(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)d\pi^* \quad \text{by (3.2)} \\ &\le \int \big(f^{\oplus}(x) - g^{\oplus}(y) + h(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)d\pi^* \\ &\le \int c(x,y)\,d\pi^* = P(c) \quad \text{by (3.23)},\end{aligned}$$

hence equality holds throughout, and this implies (3.24).

If we have pointwise convergence $h_n(x) \to h(x)$ then the claim would have been a simple consequence of Fatou's lemma, but we do not know such a convergence a priori. But [6] suggested a clever idea to handle this situation and let us carry out similar scheme in $\mathbb{R}^d$ setting. To begin, first we recall (3.9), that is

$$f_n^{\oplus}(x) \le \chi_n(x) \quad \forall x \in A, \quad \chi_n(y) \le q(y) + g_n^{\oplus}(y) \quad \forall y \in B. \tag{3.25}$$

Again fix any $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$ (not necessarily an optimizer) and let $\pi^1 := p^1_\sharp \pi$, $\pi^2 := p^2_\sharp \pi$ be its marginals on the domain and range respectively (i.e. π^1, π^2 are the copulas of π), so that in turn π^1 has $\mu_1, ..., \mu_d$ as its one-dimensional marginals and π^2 has $\nu_1, ..., \nu_d$ as its marginals. Now as we observed in Step 2, by (3.2), (3.3) and (3.25) we notice that

$$\sup_n ||\chi_n - f_n^{\oplus}||_{L^1(\pi^1)} < \infty, \quad \sup_n ||g_n^{\oplus} - \chi_n||_{L^1(\pi^2)} < \infty. \tag{3.26}$$

From this, as $f_n^{\oplus} \to f^{\oplus}$, $g_n^{\oplus} \to g^{\oplus}$, $\chi_n \to \chi$, by Fatou's lemma we see that

$$\chi - f^{\oplus} \in L^1(\pi^1), \quad g^{\oplus} - \chi \in L^1(\pi^2), \tag{3.27}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int (f_n^{\oplus} - \chi_n)\, d\pi^1 \le \int (f^{\oplus} - \chi)\, d\pi^1, \tag{3.28}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int (\chi_n - g_n^{\oplus})\, d\pi^2 \le \int (\chi - g^{\oplus})\, d\pi^2. \tag{3.29}$$

Note that $f_n^{\oplus}(x) - g_n^{\oplus}(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)$ is integrable with respect to π by (3.23) (although the integral could be $-\infty$). Hence we can proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int \big(f_n^{\oplus}(x) - g_n^{\oplus}(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big) d\pi \\
=&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int \big(f_n^{\oplus}(x) - \chi_n(x) + \chi_n(y) - g_n^{\oplus}(y) + \chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big) d\pi \\
\le& \int (f^{\oplus} - \chi)\, d\pi^1 + \int (\chi - g^{\oplus})\, d\pi^2 + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)\, d\pi.
\end{aligned}$$

To handle the last term, let $(\pi_x)_x$ be a disintegration of π with respect to π^1, and let $\xi_n : I \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be any sequence of functions satisfying $\xi_n(x) \in \partial\chi_n(x)$ for every $x \in I$. Then by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)\, d\pi \\
=&\iint \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)\, d\pi_x(y)\, d\pi^1(x) \\
=&\iint \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + \xi_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)\, d\pi_x(y)\, d\pi^1(x),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\int h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\, d\pi_x(y) = \int \xi_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\, d\pi_x(y) = 0$. Then by Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + h_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)\, d\pi \\
\le& \int \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\int \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y) + \xi_n(x)\cdot(y-x)\big)\, d\pi_x(y) \right) d\pi^1(x) \\
=& \int \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\int \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y)\big)\, d\pi_x(y) \right) d\pi^1(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Now recall that the convergence $\chi_n \to \chi$ is uniform on every compact subset of I, so in particular on a neighborhood of x. This implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}\big(\partial\chi_n(x), \partial\chi(x)\big) = 0$$

where $\partial\chi(x)$ is the set of subdifferentials of χ at x. Hence we can find a sequence $\{\nabla\chi_n(x)\}_n$ where $\nabla\chi_n(x) \in \partial\chi_n(x)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \nabla\chi_n(x) = \nabla\chi(x) \in \partial\chi(x)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int \big(\chi_n(x) - \chi_n(y)\big)\, d\pi_x(y) \\
=&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int \big(\chi_n(x) + \nabla\chi_n(x)\cdot(y-x) - \chi_n(y)\big)\, d\pi_x(y) \\
\le& \int \limsup_{n\to\infty} \big(\chi_n(x) + \nabla\chi_n(x)\cdot(y-x) - \chi_n(y)\big)\, d\pi_x(y) \\
=& \int \big(\chi(x) + \nabla\chi(x)\cdot(y-x) - \chi(y)\big)\, d\pi_x(y) \\
=& \int \big(\chi(x) + h(x)\cdot(y-x) - \chi(y)\big)\, d\pi_x(y).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim, and therefore, completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

Remark 3.2. In the proof, we saw in (3.27) that $\chi - f^{\oplus} \in L^1(\pi^1)$, $g^{\oplus} - \chi \in L^1(\pi^2)$ for every $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu,\nu)$. Is $f_i \in L^1(\mu_i)$ or $g_i \in L^1(\nu_i)$? Even in one-dimension and in a fairly mild condition, e.g. $c(x,y)$ is 1-Lipschitz and μ,ν are irreducible and compactly supported, it can happen that neither $f \in L^1(\mu)$ nor $g \in L^1(\nu)$. This is due to the presence of the linear term $h(x)\cdot(y-x)$ in the dual formulation. See [6] for more counterexamples.

4. Uniform boundedness of the convex potentials

As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the uniform boundedness property of the convex functions, Theorem 2.5, is crucial. As we remarked, Theorem 2.5 was proved in [6] in one-dimensional setting, and in particular the proof in [6] uses in an elegant way the integration by parts technique along with the compactness property of second derivative measures of convex functions. However, as it seems to us that this approach does not easily extend to higher-dimensional setting, we will first devise a different proof of Theorem 2.5 in one-dimension case in a more elementary way, in the sense that we use neither integration by parts nor second derivative measures. Then we will see that our idea works for arbitrary dimensions immediately.

We restate the theorem for convenience. Recall (2.7), (2.8) for the definition of compact intervals $J_{i,k}$, and recall $J_k := J_{1,k} \times J_{2,k} \times \ldots \times J_{d,k}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $a \in I$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $(\mu_i,\nu_i)_{i\in(d)}$ be irreducible pairs of probability measures with domain (I_i,J_i). Consider the following class of functions $\Lambda = \Lambda(a,C,\mu_i,\nu_i)$ where every $\chi \in \Lambda$ satisfies the following:*

(1) χ is a real-valued convex function on J,
(2) $\chi(a) = \nabla\chi(a) = 0$, that is 0 belongs to the subdifferential of χ at a,
(3) $\int \chi\, d(\nu^{\otimes} - \mu^{\otimes}) \le C$.

Then we have:

(1) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $M_k \ge 0$ such that $\chi \le M_k$ on J_k for every $\chi \in \Lambda$,

(2) *for any sequence* $\{\chi_n\}_n$ *in* Λ*, there exists a subsequence* $\{\chi_{n_j}\}_j$ *of* $\{\chi_n\}_n$ *and a real-valued convex function* χ *on* J *such that* $\lim_{j\to\infty}\chi_{n_j}(x)=\chi(x)$ *for every* $x\in J$*, and furthermore the convergence is uniform on every compact subset of* I*.*

The following lemma is stated in [11, Lemma 3.3]. Here μ,ν are probability measures in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\Pi(\mu,\nu)$ denotes the set of all couplings of μ,ν, and $p^1:\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$ is the first projection map, i.e. $p^1(x,y)=x$, and similarly p^2 is the second projection map: $p^2(x,y)=y$.

Lemma 4.2. [11] *Assume that* $\mu<<\mathcal{L}^d$ *with density denoted by* f*. Let* $\pi\in\Pi(\mu,\nu)$*, and let* Γ *be a set on which* π *is concentrated. Then there exists a* σ*-compact subset* $D(\Gamma)$ *of* $\Gamma\cap\mathrm{support}(\pi)$ *on which* π *is concentrated, and such that for any* $(x,y)\in D(\Gamma)$ *and* $r>0$*, there exist* $\tilde{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $\tilde{r}>0$ *such that*

$$y\in B(\tilde{y},\tilde{r})\subseteq B(y,r),\quad x\in\mathrm{Leb}(f)\cap\mathrm{Leb}(\tilde{f}), \tag{4.1}$$

$$f(x)<+\infty,\quad \textit{and}\quad \tilde{f}(x)>0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\tilde{f}$ *is the density of* $p^1_\sharp\pi\lfloor\mathbb{R}^d\times B(\tilde{y},\tilde{r})$ *with respect to* $\mathcal{L}^d$*.*

We may interpret Lemma 4.2 as a Lusin-type continuity property of probability couplings. The following is an immediate corollary of Lemma 4.2 and we will use it for the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.3. *Assume the same as in Lemma 4.2. Then for any* $(x,y)\in D(\Gamma)$ *and* $r>0$*, the restricted measure* $\pi\lfloor B(x,r)\times B(y,r)$ *is positive.*

The following class of two-points splitting martingales will also be of frequent use.

Definition 4.4. (1) *We define* $\mathfrak{m}$ *to be the set of martingale measures in* $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ *such that for any* $\zeta\in\mathfrak{m}$*,* $p^1_\sharp\zeta$ *is concentrated at a point (say* x*), and* $p^2_\sharp\zeta$ *is concentrated at two points (say* y^-,y^+*). Then necessarily* $y^-<x<y^+$ *and in this case we write* $\zeta=\zeta_{x\to(y^-,y^+)}$*. In other words,* $\zeta_{x\to(y^-,y^+)}=\frac{y^+-x}{y^+-y^-}\delta_{(x,y^-)}+\frac{x-y^-}{y^+-y^-}\delta_{(x,y^+)}$*.*

(2) *We define* $\mathfrak{M}$ *to be the set of martingale measures in* $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ *such that for any* $\pi\in\mathfrak{M}$*, there exists a disintegration* $(\pi_x)_x$ *of* π *with respect to* $p^1_\sharp\pi$ *such that* $\pi_x\in\mathfrak{m}$ *for* $p^1_\sharp\pi$ *- a.e.* x*.*

(3) *We define* $\mathfrak{M}(\mu,\nu):=\mathfrak{M}\cap\mathrm{MT}(\mu,\nu)$*.*

Remark 4.5. We can describe the martingales in $\mathfrak{M}$ in terms of Brownian motion and stopping time in a natural way. Let $\pi\in\mathfrak{M}$, and let D be a Borel set in $\mathbb{R}$ where $p^1_\sharp\pi(D)=1$ and a disintegration $(\pi_x)_x$ of π with respect to $p^1_\sharp\pi$ is well-defined for every $x\in D$. Write $\pi_x=\pi_{x\to(y^-(x),y^+(x))}\in\mathfrak{m}$, and for each $x\in D$ define the stopping time τ_x as the first hitting time of $(B^x_t)_t$, a Brownian motion starting at x, to the boundary $\{y^-(x),y^+(x)\}$. That is $\tau_x=\inf\{t\geq 0\,|\,B^x_t\notin]y^-(x),y^+(x)[\}$. Write $\tau=(\tau_x)_x$ and let $(B_t)_t$ be a Brownian motion with $\mathrm{Law}(B_0)=p^1_\sharp\pi$. Then by construction, $\mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau_x})=p^2_\sharp\pi_x$ for each $x\in D$, and $\mathrm{Law}(B_\tau)=p^2_\sharp\pi$.

Now we begin the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof. **Step 1.** We will begin with the most simple case where $d=1$ and there is $\zeta=\zeta_{x\to(y^-,y^+)}\in\mathfrak{m}$ such that $\mu=p^1_\sharp\zeta$ and $\nu=p^2_\sharp\zeta$, that is $\mu=\delta_x$ and $\nu=\frac{y^+-x}{y^+-y^-}\delta_{y^-}+\frac{x-y^-}{y^+-y^-}\delta_{y^+}$. For $x,y\in\mathbb{R}$, $x\neq y$, we define the open / closed transport ray

$$]\!]x,y[\![=\{(1-t)x+ty\,|\,0<t<1\},\quad [\![x,y]\!]=\{(1-t)x+ty\,|\,0\leq t\leq 1\}.$$

Assume that there is $a \in]\!]y^-, y^+[\![$ and $C > 0$ such that $\chi(a) = \nabla\chi(a) = 0$ and $\int \chi\, d(\nu - \mu) \leq C$ for every $\chi \in \Lambda$. First, consider the case $a = x$. Then it is trivial that there is a constant $M > 0$ such that $\chi(y^-) \leq M$ and $\chi(y^+) \leq M$, since $\int \chi\, d(\nu - \mu) = \int \chi\, d\nu = \frac{y^+ - x}{y^+ - y^-}\chi(y^-) + \frac{x - y^-}{y^+ - y^-}\chi(y^+) \leq C$. By convexity of χ, we see that $\chi \leq M$ on $[\![y^-, y^+]\!]$ for every $\chi \in \Lambda$, proving the theorem in this most simple case.

Next, suppose that a is away from x, say $y^- < a < x$. Our tactics is to find probability measures $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}$ where $\mu \leq_c \tilde{\mu} \leq_c \tilde{\nu} \leq_c \nu$, and to find a small but positive constant θ (which does not depend on $\chi \in \Lambda$) where the measure $\eta := \theta\, \zeta_{a \to (y^-, y^+)}$ satisfies $p^1_\sharp \eta \leq \tilde{\mu}$ and $p^2_\sharp \eta \leq \tilde{\nu}$. If we can do so, then as $\int \chi\, d(\tilde{\nu} - \tilde{\mu}) \leq C$ we see that $\int \chi\, d(p^2_\sharp \eta - p^1_\sharp \eta) \leq C$. As $\eta := \theta\, \zeta_{a \to (y^-, y^+)}$, we are reduced to the previous case and the theorem is proved. Notice that in this case, we simply can take $\tilde{\nu} = \nu$ and $\tilde{\mu} = p^2_\sharp \zeta_{x \to (a, y^+)}$. As $y^- < a < x$ it is clear that $\tilde{\mu} \leq_c \nu$. Then we take $\theta = \tilde{\mu}(a) = \frac{y^+ - x}{y^+ - a}$.

We can describe this procedure in terms of Brownian motion and stopping time as we did in Remark 4.5. Recall that $(B^x_t)_t$ denotes a Brownian motion starting at x. Define the stopping time $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 \,|\, B^x_t \notin]y^-, y^+[\}$. Then $\mathrm{Law}(B^x_\tau) = \nu$. Next, define $\tau^1 = \inf\{t \geq 0 \,|\, B^x_t \notin]a, y^+[\}$ and $\tilde{\mu} = \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^1})$. Then as $\tau^1 \leq \tau$ we have $\tilde{\mu} \leq_c \nu$. Finally, define τ^2 as the following: if $B^x_{\tau^1} = y^+$ then $\tau^2 = \tau^1$, and if $B^x_{\tau^1} = a$ then $\tau^2 = \tau^1 + \inf\{t \geq 0 \,|\, B^a_t \notin]y^-, y^+[\}$. We may define $\tilde{\nu} = \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^2})$, but $\tilde{\nu} = \nu$ simply because $\tau^2 = \tau$.

The case $x < a < y^+$ can be treated similarly and Step 1 is done.

Step 2. We will consider the case where (μ, ν) are the marginals of a martingale meaure $\pi := \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \zeta_{x_i \to (y_i^-, y_i^+)}$. Here $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_i > 0, \sum p_i = 1$, and $\zeta_{x_i \to (y_i^-, y_i^+)} \in \mathfrak{m}$, $i = 1, 2, ..., N$, satisfies the following chain condition: if we let $l_k = \min_{i \leq k} y_i^-$, $r_k = \max_{i \leq k} y_i^+$, then

$$]\!]l_k, r_k[\![\cap]\!]y^-_{k+1}, y^+_{k+1}[\![\neq \emptyset, \quad \forall k = 1, ..., N-1.$$

The chain condition immediately implies that (μ, ν) is irreducible. As it is enough to prove this step with $N = 2$, we assume $N = 2$. Without loss of generality assume that $a \in]\!]y_1^-, y_1^+[\![$ such that $\chi(a) = \nabla\chi(a) = 0$ and $\int \chi\, d(\nu - \mu) \leq C$ for every $\chi \in \Lambda$. Then as $p_1 \zeta_{x_1 \to (y_1^-, y_1^+)} \leq \pi$, by Step 1 we see that there exists $M_1, M_1' > 0$ such that for every $\chi \in \Lambda$

(1) $\chi \leq M_1$ on $[\![y_1^-, y_1^+]\!]$, and
(2) $\nabla\chi \leq M_1'$ on $[\![y_1^- + \varepsilon, y_1^+ - \varepsilon]\!]$, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.

M_1' may depend on ε but it does not depend on $\chi \in \Lambda$. Note that (1) follows from Step 1 and (2) follows from (1) and the fact that χ is convex. Now take ε small enough such that

$$]\!]y_1^- + \varepsilon, y_1^+ - \varepsilon[\![\cap]\!]y_2^- + \varepsilon, y_2^+ - \varepsilon[\![\neq \emptyset.$$

Fix a point $b \in]\!]y_1^- + \varepsilon, y_1^+ - \varepsilon[\![\cap]\!]y_2^- + \varepsilon, y_2^+ - \varepsilon[\![$ and take any $\chi \in \Lambda$. Let L_χ be an affine function which supports the convex function χ at b, that is $L_\chi(b) = \chi(b), \nabla L_\chi(b) = \nabla\chi(b)$. Let $\tilde{\chi} = \chi - L_\chi$. Then $\tilde{\chi}(b) = \nabla\tilde{\chi}(b) = 0$ and $\int \tilde{\chi}\, d(\nu - \mu) \leq C$, hence by the observation (1), (2) and the Step 1 we deduce that there exists $M_2 > 0$ such that for every $\chi \in \Lambda$ we have $\chi \leq M_2$ on $[\![y_2^-, y_2^+]\!]$. Step 2 is done.

Step 3. We will begin to deal with general irreducible pair (μ, ν) with domain (I, J) in dimension $d = 1$. In this case, it is well-known that there exists a probability measure $\tilde{\mu}$ such that $\tilde{\mu}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, $\mu \leq_c \tilde{\mu} \leq_c \nu$, and $(\tilde{\mu}, \nu)$ is irreducible with the same domain (I, J). One way to see this is the following: consider u_μ, u_ν, the potential functions of μ, ν. They coincide outside of I while $u_\mu < u_\nu$

in I by irreducibility. Select a convex function u such that $u_\mu = u = u_\nu$ outside of I while $u_\mu < u < u_\nu$ in I. Then $\tilde{\mu}$ is taken to be the second derivative measure of u, and by selecting sufficiently smooth u one can get the absolute continuity as desired. Hence from now on we will assume without loss of generality that $\mu << \mathcal{L}^1$. Also note that we can assume $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$ since the pair $(\mu - \mu\wedge\nu, \nu - \mu\wedge\nu)$ is irreducible with domain (I, J) and $\int \chi\, d\big((\nu - \mu\wedge\nu) - (\mu - \mu\wedge\nu)\big) \le C$. Thus, we will assume $\mu << \mathcal{L}^1$ and $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$ in the rest of the proof.

Our strategy is to reduce this situation to Step 1 and Step 2. For this, we begin by choosing a martingale measure $\pi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mu, \nu)$. We can obtain such π by solving a martingale optimal transport problem with cost $c(x, y) = |x - y|$; see [22], [23], [5] for example. Let $(\pi_x)_x$ be a disintegration of π with respect to μ, and let $x \mapsto y^-(x)$, $x \mapsto y^+(x)$ be two functions supporting π, that is $\pi_x = \frac{y^+(x)-x}{y^+(x)-y^-(x)}\delta_{y^-(x)} + \frac{x-y^-(x)}{y^+(x)-y^-(x)}\delta_{y^+(x)}$ for μ - a.e. x.

Now by Corollary 4.3, there exists $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ such that $\pi(\Gamma) = 1$ and for any $(x, y) \in \Gamma$ and $r > 0$, the restricted measure $\pi\lfloor B(x, r) \times B(y, r)$ is positive.

Pick $(x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma$ and assume $x_0 < y_0$. Fix $z \in]\!]x_0, y_0[\![$ and let $r > 0$ be small such that $x_r := x_0 + r < z < y_r := y_0 - r$. Now we claim the following: there are positive measures $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\mu}_A, \tilde{\nu}_A$ where $\tilde{\mu}_A \le_c \tilde{\mu} \le_c \tilde{\nu} \le_c \tilde{\nu}_A$, $\tilde{\mu}_A \le \mu$, $\tilde{\nu}_A \le \nu$, and a positive constant $\tilde{\theta}$ such that the measure $\eta := \tilde{\theta}\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)}$ satisfies $p^1_\sharp\eta \le \tilde{\mu}$ and $p^2_\sharp\eta \le \tilde{\nu}$.

To see this, note that the set $A := \{x \in B(x_0, r) \,|\, y^+(x) \in B(y_0, r)\}$ has μ - positive measure since the restricted measure $\pi\lfloor B(x_0, r) \times B(y_0, r)$ is positive. For each $x \in A$, consider the martingale $\zeta_{x\to(y^-(x),y^+(x))}$. Recall $y^-(x) < x < x_r < z < y_r < y^+(x)$.

Now we apply the same idea as in Step 1: Let $\tau_x = \inf\{t \ge 0 \,|\, B^x_t \notin]y^-(x), y^+(x)[\}$ and $\tau^1_x = \inf\{t \ge 0 \,|\, B^x_t \notin]y^-(x), z[\}$. Then define τ^2_x as follows: if $B^x_{\tau^1_x} = y^-(x)$ then $\tau^2_x = \tau^1_x$, and if $B^x_{\tau^1_x} = z$ then $\tau^2_x = \tau^1_x + \inf\{t \ge 0 \,|\, B^z_t \notin]x_r, y_r[\}$. Then clearly

$$\delta_x \le_c \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^1_x}) \le_c \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^2_x}) \le_c \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau_x}) \tag{4.3}$$

and notice that with $\theta = \theta(x, z) := \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^1_x})(z) = \frac{x-y^-(x)}{z-y^-(x)}$, the measure $\theta\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)}$ satisfies

$$p^1_\sharp\theta\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)} \le \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^1_x}), \quad p^2_\sharp\theta\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)} \le \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^2_x}). \tag{4.4}$$

Finally, let $\tilde{\theta}(z) = \int_A \theta(x, z)\, d\mu(x)$, which is positive, and observe that the measure $\tilde{\theta}\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)}$ is what we are looking for. To see this, consider the restricted measure $\pi_A := \pi\lfloor A \times \mathbb{R}$ and let $\tilde{\mu}_A := p^1_\sharp\pi_A$, $\tilde{\nu}_A := p^2_\sharp\pi_A$. Then clearly $\tilde{\mu}_A \le_c \tilde{\nu}_A$, $\tilde{\mu}_A \le \mu$, $\tilde{\nu}_A \le \nu$. Define $\tilde{\mu} = \int_A \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^1_x})\, d\mu(x)$, $\tilde{\nu} = \int_A \mathrm{Law}(B^x_{\tau^2_x})\, d\mu(x)$. Then in view of (4.3) we see that $\tilde{\mu}_A \le_c \tilde{\mu} \le_c \tilde{\nu} \le_c \tilde{\nu}_A$, and by (4.4) and $\eta := \tilde{\theta}\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)}$ we have $p^1_\sharp\eta \le \tilde{\mu}$ and $p^2_\sharp\eta \le \tilde{\nu}$.

In summary, we have shown that for any $(x, y) \in \Gamma$ and $z \in]\!]x, y[\![$ and any sufficiently small $r > 0$, we can find $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\mu}_A, \tilde{\nu}_A$ where $\tilde{\mu}_A \le_c \tilde{\mu} \le_c \tilde{\nu} \le_c \tilde{\nu}_A$, $\tilde{\mu}_A \le \mu$, $\tilde{\nu}_A \le \nu$, and a positive constant $\tilde{\theta}$ such that the measure $\eta := \tilde{\theta}\,\zeta_{z\to(x_r,y_r)}$ satisfies $p^1_\sharp\eta \le \tilde{\mu}$ and $p^2_\sharp\eta \le \tilde{\nu}$. Now we make the following observation. Since $\pi(\Gamma) = 1$, for any $z \in I$ there exists $(x_z, y_z) \in \Gamma$ such that $z \in]\!]x_z, y_z[\![$, since otherwise we would have $u_\mu(z) = u_\nu(z)$, contradicting to the irreducibility of (μ, ν). We choose such $(x_z, y_z) \in \Gamma$ for each $z \in I$ so that $\{\,]\!]x_z, y_z[\![\,\}_{z\in I}$ is an open cover of I. Hence we can find a sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

(1) $\{\,]\!]x_{z_n}, y_{z_n}[\![\,\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an open cover of I, and
(2) If $l_k := \min_{n\le k} x_{z_n}$, $r_k := \max_{n\le k} y_{z_n}$, then $]\!]l_k, r_k[\![\cap\,]\!]x_{z_{k+1}}, y_{z_{k+1}}[\![\neq \emptyset$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now Step 2 implies that for a given compact interval $K \subseteq I$, there exists $M_K > 0$ such that $\chi \le M_K$ on K for every $\chi \in \Lambda$, which is the content of the theorem when ν has no

mass on the boundary of I. To see this, observe that for a compact K there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{\,]\!]x_{z_n}, y_{z_n}[\![\,\}_{n\le N}$ is an open cover of K, so for small $r>0$ the shrunken covering $\{\,]\!]x_{z_n}+r, y_{z_n}-r[\![\,\}_{n\le N}$ still covers K and satisfies the chain condition (2), hence Step 2 applies. Step 3 is done.

Step 4. We will deal with the case when ν assigns positive mass on the boundary of I. Write $I =]a,b[$ and suppose that $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu(b) > 0$. Recall that $\pi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mu,\nu)$ and $x \mapsto (y^-(x), y^+(x))$ is the graph of π. Let $A := \{x \,|\, y^+(x) = b\}$. $\nu(b) > 0$ implies $\mu(A) > 0$. Take any $x \in A$ satisfying $(x,b) \in \Gamma$. Then Step 3 tells us that for any $r>0$ and $z \in]x+r, b[$, we can find measures $\tilde\mu, \tilde\nu, \tilde\mu_A, \tilde\nu_A$ where $\tilde\mu_A \le_c \tilde\mu \le_c \tilde\nu \le_c \tilde\nu_A$, $\tilde\mu_A \le \mu$, $\tilde\nu_A \le \nu$, and $\tilde\theta > 0$ such that $\eta = \tilde\theta\, \zeta_{z \to (x+r,b)}$ satisfies $p^1_\sharp \eta \le \tilde\mu$ and $p^2_\sharp \eta \le \tilde\nu$. In conjunction with Step 3 we see that for any $t \in I$, there exists $M>0$ such that $\chi \le M$ on $[t,b]$ for every $\chi \in \Lambda$.

The case $\nu(a) > 0$ can be treated similarly, and finally note that if both $\nu(a) > 0$ and $\nu(b) > 0$ then we can conclude that there exists $M > 0$ such that $\chi \le M$ on $[a,b]$ for every $\chi \in \Lambda$, because $[a,b]$ can be covered with finitely many appropriate intervals that we have discussed so far. The proof is complete for the dimension 1 case.

Step 5. We will deal with the case of general dimensions. We will explain that how the ideas in the previous steps can be applied just as well but only with notational difficulty. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be the dimension which is arbitrary but fixed.

As in Step 1, let us begin with the most simple case where for each $i \in (d)$ there is $\zeta_i = \zeta_{x_i \to (y_i^-, y_i^+)} \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that $\mu_i = p^1_\sharp \zeta_i$ and $\nu_i = p^2_\sharp \zeta_i$, that is $\mu_i = \delta_{x_i}$ and $\nu_i = \frac{y_i^+ - x_i}{y_i^+ - y_i^-}\delta_{y_i^-} + \frac{x_i - y_i^-}{y_i^+ - y_i^-}\delta_{y_i^+}$. Let $\mu := \otimes_i \mu_i$, $\nu := \otimes_i \nu_i$ and $\zeta := \otimes_i \zeta_i$. Note that the martingale measure ζ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ has μ, ν as its marginals.

Now we want to prove that there exists $M > 0$ such that $\chi \le M$ on J for all $\chi \in \Lambda$, where $J = \mathrm{conv}(\mathrm{supp}\,\nu)$ is the convex hull of the support of ν. Notice that J is a closed rectangle in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathrm{supp}\,\nu$ is the set of its vertices, consisting of 2^d points.

Assume that there is $a \in I$ (where $I = \mathrm{int}\, J$) and $C > 0$ such that $\chi(a) = \nabla\chi(a) = 0$ and $\int \chi\, d(\nu - \mu) \le C$ for every $\chi \in \Lambda$. First, consider the case $a = x$, where $x = (x_1, ..., x_d)$. Then just as in Step 1, it is trivial that there is a constant $M > 0$ such that $\chi \le M$ on $\mathrm{supp}\,\nu$. By convexity of χ, we see that $\chi \le M$ on J for every $\chi \in \Lambda$, proving the theorem in this most simple case.

If $x \ne a = (a_1, ..., a_d)$, in Step 1 we found probability measures $\tilde\mu_i, \tilde\nu_i$ where $\mu_i \le_c \tilde\mu_i \le_c \tilde\nu_i \le_c \nu_i$ and a constant $\theta_i > 0$ such that the measure $\eta_i := \theta_i\, \zeta_{a_i \to (y_i^-, y_i^+)}$ satisfies $p^1_\sharp \eta_i \le \tilde\mu_i$ and $p^2_\sharp \eta_i \le \tilde\nu_i$. By letting $\tilde\mu^\otimes := \otimes_i \tilde\mu_i$, $\tilde\nu^\otimes := \otimes_i \tilde\nu_i$ and $\eta^\otimes := \otimes_i \eta_i$, we observe that $\int \chi\, d(\tilde\nu^\otimes - \tilde\mu^\otimes) \le C$ implies $\int \chi\, d(p^2_\sharp \eta^\otimes - p^1_\sharp \eta^\otimes) \le C$. As $\mathrm{supp}(p^1_\sharp \eta^\otimes) = \{a\}$ and $\mathrm{supp}(p^2_\sharp \eta^\otimes) = \mathrm{supp}\,\nu$, we are reduced to the previous case and the theorem is proved. In words, we decompose the one-step martingale ζ into a two-step martingale, then we find η which is a part of the second step martingale and has the first marginal at the point a and the second marginal on $\mathrm{supp}\,\nu$.

Now notice that we can carry out Step 2, 3 and 4 in this general dimension case exactly the same way, that is we can find a countable rectangular martingale measures (say $(\zeta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$) which covers I and satisfies the appropriate chain condition. We observed in Step 2 that the boundedness property of χ propagates along such a chain, and the argument works in the same way in higher dimensions. Finally if each marginal measures ν_i assigns positive mass on the boundary of I_i, then we observe that the rectangles can cover up to such boundaries

so that we get the desired boundedness of all $\chi \in \Lambda$ up to the boundary. This completes the proof of the item (1).

Step 6. It remains to prove the item (2), and it is a direct consequence of item (1) and an application of Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, as follows: item (1) tells us that every $\chi \in \Lambda$ is uniformly bounded on any compact subset of I, so with convexity and $\chi(a) = \nabla\chi(a) = 0$ this implies that the derivative of every $\chi \in \Lambda$ is also uniformly bounded on any compact subset of I. Hence by Arzelà-Ascoli theorem we deduce that for any sequence $\{\chi_n\}$ in Λ and any compact set K in I, there exists a subsequence of $\{\chi_n\}$ that converges uniformly on K. Now by increasing K to I and using diagonal argument, we can find a subsequence of $\{\chi_n\}$ that converges pointwise in I, and in fact, the convergence is uniform on every compact subset of I.

What about on $J \setminus I$? We can argue in the same way and let us explain in dimension 2 to avoid cumbersome notations. Suppose that, for example, $J_1 = [a_1, b_1[$, $J_2 = [a_2, b_2[$, and $J = J_1 \times J_2$ as usual. First of all, at the southwest corner point (a_1, a_2) the sequence $\{\chi_n\}$ is bounded, so we can choose a subsequence which converges at (a_1, a_2). Next, on any compact interval in the open line $\{(x, a_2) \,|\, a_1 < x < b_1\}$ the sequence $\{\chi_n\}$ is also uniformly bounded, so by Arzelà-Ascoli theorem with diagonal argument as above we can find a further subsequence which converges everywhere on $\{(x, a_2) \,|\, a_1 < x < b_1\}$. Finally, we can find a further subsequence which converges on $\{(a_1, y) \,|\, a_2 < y < b_2\}$, and hence it converges everywhere on J. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

5. Optimality of the copulas revealed by martingale Legendre transform

Suppose that a triple $(f_i, g_i, h)_{i\in(d)}$ satisfies (3.5), that is

$$f^{\oplus}(x) - g^{\oplus}(y) + h(x) \cdot (y - x) \le c(x, y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in A,\, y \in B, \tag{5.1}$$

where $f^{\oplus}(x) = \sum_i f_i(x_i)$, $g^{\oplus}(y) = \sum_i g_i(y_i)$, $A = A_1 \times ... \times A_d$, $B = B_1 \times ... \times B_d$, and $\mu_i(A_i) = 1$, $\nu_i(B_i) = 1$ as before. In order to study the geometry of MMOT plans, we wish that the triple $(f_i, g_i, h)_{i\in(d)}$ satisfying (5.1) has some regularity property, so that we can apply differential calculus on them. In optimal transport theory, the Legendre transform turned out to be the right tool to obtain such regularity; see [17]. Recently, in the same spirit [19] defined the martingale Legendre transform and studied its regularity property. In this section, we will see how the notion of Legendre transform and martingale Legendre transform works together in MMOT problem and its duality formulation, and in particular, we will see how they reveal optimality of the copulas of MMOT.

We begin by rearranging (5.1) as

$$f^{\oplus}(x) + h(x) \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y) \le g^{\oplus}(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in A,\, y \in B. \tag{5.2}$$

Now the martingale Legendre transform of $g^{\oplus}(y)$ is a pair of functions $(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma})$, where $\alpha : \text{int}(\text{conv}(B)) \to \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{\gamma} : \text{int}(\text{conv}(B)) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ are defined as in [19, Definition 3.1]:

$$\alpha(x) := \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} \,|\, \exists b \in \mathbb{R}^d \ \text{ such that } \ a + b \cdot (y - x) \le g^{\oplus}(y) + c(x, y),\ \forall y \in B\}, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}(x) := \{b \in \mathbb{R}^d \,|\, \alpha(x) + b \cdot (y - x) \le g^{\oplus}(y) + c(x, y),\ \forall y \in B\}. \tag{5.4}$$

Note that $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a convex set-valued function, and recall that $\text{int}(\text{conv}(B)) = I$, since $\text{int}(\text{conv}(\text{supp}\,\nu_i)) = I_i$. Then the inverse martingale Legendre transform of $(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma})$ is

$$\beta(y) := \sup_{x\in I, b\in\tilde{\gamma}(x)} \{\alpha(x) + b \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y)\}. \tag{5.5}$$

By definition of $\alpha, \tilde{\gamma}, \beta$, it is immediate that (with any measurable choice $\gamma(x) \in \tilde{\gamma}(x)$)

$$f^{\oplus}(x) \le \alpha(x) \text{ for all } x \in A, \quad g^{\oplus}(y) \ge \beta(y) \text{ for all } y \in B, \tag{5.6}$$

$$\alpha(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y) \le \beta(y) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in I,\, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.7}$$

Observe that (5.6) is the dual problem of optimal transport (also called Kantorovich dual problem) with given marginals $(\mu_1, ..., \mu_d)$ and $(\nu_1, ..., \nu_d)$, respectively. Therefore we can apply Legendre transform to replace each $f_i(x_i)$ and $g_i(y_i)$ with, say, $\varphi_i(x_i)$ and $\psi_i(y_i)$ respectively, as follows:
define $\varphi_1(x_1) = \inf_{x_i \in A_i, 2 \le i \le d} \big(\alpha(x) - \sum_{i \ge 2} f_i(x_i)\big)$ and note that φ_1 is now defined on I_1 as α is defined on I. We then successively define for $j = 2, ..., d$ by

$$\varphi_j(x_j) := \inf_{\substack{x_i \in I_i, i < j \\ x_i \in A_i, i > j}} \big(\alpha(x) - \sum_{i<j} \varphi_i(x_i) - \sum_{i>j} f_i(x_i)\big).$$

Similarly, we define ψ_j successively from $j = 1$ to $j = d$ by

$$\psi_j(y_j) = \sup_{\substack{y_i \in J_i, i < j \\ y_i \in B_i, i > j}} \big(\beta(y) - \sum_{i<j} \psi_i(y_i) - \sum_{i>j} g_i(y_i)\big).$$

Notice that by definition

$$\varphi_i(x_i) \ge f_i(x_i) \quad \forall x_i \in A_i, \qquad \psi_i(y_i) \le g_i(y_i) \quad \forall y_i \in B_i, \tag{5.8}$$

$$\varphi^{\oplus}(x) := \sum_i \varphi_i(x_i) \le \alpha(x), \quad \psi^{\oplus}(y) := \sum_i \psi_i(y_i) \ge \beta(y), \tag{5.9}$$

hence by (5.7) we have

$$f^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y) \le \varphi^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y) \le \psi^{\oplus}(y) \le g^{\oplus}(y).$$

Now if (f_i, g_i) are the limits of a weak dual maximizer as in Theorem 3.1, and if $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu, \nu)$ is any minimizer for the problem (1.9), then by Theorem 3.1 we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y) &= \varphi^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x) \cdot (y - x) - c(x, y) \\ &= \psi^{\oplus}(y) = g^{\oplus}(y) \quad \pi - a.s. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, in view of (5.2), (5.8), (5.9), we see that

$$f^{\oplus}(x) = \varphi^{\oplus}(x) = \alpha(x) \quad \pi^1 - a.s., \quad g^{\oplus}(y) = \psi^{\oplus}(y) = \beta(y) \quad \pi^2 - a.s. \tag{5.10}$$

This means that π^1, π^2 are optimizers for the dual optimal transport problem with respect to the costs α and β respectively, and $\{f_i\}_{i \in (d)}$ (also $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in (d)}$) and $\{g_i\}_{i \in (d)}$ (also $\{\psi_i\}_{i \in (d)}$) are the corresponding dual optimizers. We summarize in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that a triple $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i \in (d)}$ is a dual solution of the problem (1.9), i.e. $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i \in (d)}$ satisfies (3.5) and (3.6). Let $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu, \nu)$ be any minimizer for (1.9). Then the first and second copulas π^1, π^2 of π solve the dual optimal transport problem with respect to the costs α, β respectively, in the following sense:*

$$\sum_i f_i(x_i) \le \alpha(x) \quad \mu_i - a.e.\, x_i \quad \forall i \in (d), \quad \textit{and} \quad \sum_i f_i(x_i) = \alpha(x) \quad \pi^1 - a.e.\, x,$$

$$\sum_i g_i(y_i) \ge \beta(y) \quad \nu_i - a.e.\, y_i \quad \forall i \in (d), \quad \textit{and} \quad \sum_i g_i(y_i) = \beta(y) \quad \pi^2 - a.e.\, y.$$

Each φ_i is now defined on an open interval I_i, and we hope that they may inherit some regularity property from α, so that we may apply a certain calculus of variations to study the structure of optimal $\pi \in \mathrm{MMT}(\mu, \nu)$. We will do this in the next section.

6. Geometry of multi-martingale optimal transport

In this section, we will study the geometry of multi-martingale optimal transport when the cost is given by a strictly convex norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$, that is $c(x,y) = ||x-y||$ where

(6.1) The norm $||\cdot||$ is strictly convex, and $x \mapsto ||x||$ is differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$.

The main purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2.7, which we restate:

Theorem 6.1. *Let $(\mu_i, \nu_i)_{i\in(d)}$ be pairs of compactly supported probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ which are in convex order, and suppose that μ_i is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure for every $i \in (d)$. Let $c(x,y) = \pm||x-y||$ where $||\cdot||$ satisfies (6.1). Let π be any minimizer for the problem (1.9). Then:*

(1) if $c(x,y) = -||x-y||$, then for any disintegration $(\pi_x)_x$ of π with respect to the first copula π^1, the support of π_x coincides with the extreme points of the closed convex hull of itself, that is

$$\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right), \quad \pi^1 - a.e.\, x.$$

(2) if $c(x,y) = ||x-y||$, then the common copula $\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2$ stays put under π in the sense that if we define $D : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by $D(x) = (x,x)$, then the push-forward measure of $\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2$ by the map D is dominated by π, i.e. $D_\#(\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2) \leq \pi$. Let $\tilde{\pi} = \pi - D_\#(\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2)$ and let $(\tilde{\pi}_x)_x$ be its disintegration with respect to the first copula $\tilde{\pi}^1$. Then

$$\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\pi}_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\pi}_x)\right), \quad \tilde{\pi}^1 - a.e.\, x.$$

Hence, either $\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right)$ or $\operatorname{supp}\pi_x = \operatorname{Ext}\left(\overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_x)\right) \cup \{x\}$.

Proof. **Step 1.** Our first aim is to show that the theorem holds true when (μ_i, ν_i) are irreducible pairs of probability measures with domain (I_i, J_i) for each $i \in (d)$. For this goal, in this step we will obtain some regularity properties of functions which are involved in the duality, thereby establishing a certain differential identity.

Notice that since μ_i's are compactly supported, the assumption (3.3) on the cost is obviously met (and this is the only place where the compact support of μ is used). Also, since the cost $\pm||x-y||$ is continuous and Lipschitz, a weak dual maximizer satisfying (3.1), (3.2) exists by [39, Theorem 2.1]. Hence all assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are met, therefore we have a dual solution $(f_i, g_i, h_i)_{i\in(d)}$ satisfying (3.5), (3.6).

By martingale Legendre transform (5.3), (5.4) we have $f^{\oplus}(x) \leq \alpha(x)$, and by defining $f_i := -\infty$ on a μ_i-null set and $g_i := +\infty$ on a ν_i-null set for every $i \in (d)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(y-x) - c(x,y) &\leq \alpha(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(y-x) - c(x,y) \\ &\leq g^{\oplus}(y) \quad \forall x \in I, \forall y \in J, \end{aligned}$$

and equality holds throughout for π - a.s. Now [19, Theorem 3.2] showed that

(6.2) α is locally Lipschitz in I, and γ is locally bounded in I.

We want $f_i(x_i)_{i\in(d)}$ have Lipschitz property, so we will take the Legendre transform with respect to α to obtain such property. But as α is in general only locally Lipschitz, we will take the transform locally as follows: write $I_i =]a_i, b_i[$ and for small $\varepsilon > 0$, let $I_i^\varepsilon =]a_i + \varepsilon, b_i - \varepsilon[$ for each $i \in (d)$ and $I^\varepsilon = I_1^\varepsilon \times ... \times I_d^\varepsilon$. Now define successively for $i = 1, 2, ..., d$ by

$$\varphi_i(x_i) := \inf_{x_j \in I_j^\varepsilon, j\neq i} \left(\alpha(x) - \sum_{j<i} \varphi_j(x_j) - \sum_{j>i} f_j(x_j)\right). \tag{6.3}$$

Then φ_i is defined on I_i^ε for every $i \in (d)$, and the definition immediately implies

$$f_i(x_i) \le \varphi_i(x_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i \varphi_i(x_i) \le \alpha(x) \quad \forall x_i \in I_i^\varepsilon,\ i \in (d). \tag{6.4}$$

Also notice that since α is Lipschitz in I^ε and ε is positive, (6.3) implies

$$\varphi_i \text{ is Lipschitz in } I_i^\varepsilon, \quad \forall\, i \in (d). \tag{6.5}$$

Let $\pi_\varepsilon := \pi \lfloor I^\varepsilon \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the restiction of π on $I^\varepsilon \times \mathbb{R}^d$, let π_ε^1 be the first copula of π_ε, i.e. $\pi_\varepsilon^1 = \pi^1 \lfloor I^\varepsilon$, and let $(\mu_i^\varepsilon)_{i\in(d)}$ be the one-dimensional marginals of π_ε^1. As $\mu_i^\varepsilon \le \mu_i << \mathcal{L}^1$ each φ_i is differentiable μ_i^ε -a.s., hence

$$\varphi^\oplus(x) := \sum_i \varphi_i(x_i) \text{ is differentiable} \quad \pi_\varepsilon^1 - a.s. \tag{6.6}$$

Now we have

$$\varphi^\oplus(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(y-x) - c(x,y) \le g^\oplus(y) \quad \forall x \in I^\varepsilon,\, \forall y \in J, \tag{6.7}$$

$$\varphi^\oplus(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(y-x) - c(x,y) = g^\oplus(y) \quad \pi_\varepsilon - a.s. \tag{6.8}$$

We may rewrite (6.8) as

$$\text{For } \pi_\varepsilon^1 - a.e.\, x, \quad \varphi^\oplus(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(y-x) - c(x,y) = g^\oplus(y) \quad \pi_x - a.e.\, y. \tag{6.9}$$

Fix x_0 at which (6.9) holds and $\varphi^\oplus$ is differentiable. Let V_0 be the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ spanned by the set $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} - x_0$ (translation of $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$ by $-x_0$). If $\dim V_0 = 0$ then it simply means $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} = \{x_0\}$ and there is nothing to prove. Thus let us assume that $\dim V_0 \ge 1$. Now [19, Lemma 4.1] showed that, if (6.1), (6.7), (6.9) holds then

$$\operatorname{proj}_{V_0}\gamma \text{ has a directional derivative at } x_0 \text{ in every direction } u \in V_0, \tag{6.10}$$

where $\operatorname{proj}_{V_0}\gamma$ is the orthogonal projection of the $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued function γ on V_0. While a detailed proof can be found in [19, Lemma 4.1], here let us give some intuition: in (6.7) the function $y \mapsto \varphi^\oplus(x_0) + \gamma(x_0)\cdot(y-x_0) - c(x_0,y)$ is bounded above by $g^\oplus(y)$, but (6.9) tells us that the function is in fact tightly bounded by $g^\oplus(y)$ for π_{x_0} - a.e. y. As π_{x_0} has barycenter at x_0 and $\varphi^\oplus$ is differentiable at x_0, $\operatorname{proj}_{V_0}\gamma$ has not much room to vary wildly near x_0 in V_0, hence it is forced to be differentiable at x_0 in V_0.

Next, note that (6.7), (6.9) imply that for $\pi_{x_0} - a.e.\, y$,

$$\varphi^\oplus(x_0) + \gamma(x_0)\cdot(y-x_0) - c(x_0,y) \ge \varphi^\oplus(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(y-x) - c(x,y) \quad \forall x \in I^\varepsilon \tag{6.11}$$

but notice that by continuity of c, (6.11) holds for every $y \in \operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$. Then (6.6), (6.10) implies that for any nonzero vector u in V_0, by taking u-directional derivative at x_0 in x variable, we find

$$\nabla_u\varphi^\oplus(x_0) + \nabla_u\gamma(x_0)\cdot(y-x_0) - \gamma(x_0)\cdot u - \nabla_u c(x_0,y) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} \setminus \{x_0\}. \tag{6.12}$$

From this equality [19] proved the theorem when the cost is given by the Euclidean norm. We will follow a similar line but as we deal with more general strictly convex norms, we shall need a more involved argument.

Step 2. In this step we will establish the "non-staying" property in the case $c(x,y) = -||x-y||$, on the other hand we will establish the "staying" property in the case $c(x,y) = +||x-y||$.

Assume that $c(x,y) = -||x-y||$. Then (6.11) immediately implies that $x_0 \notin \operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$ (which we call the non-staying property of the minimizer π) by the following reason: if $x_0 \in \operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$, then the function $x \mapsto \varphi^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(x_0 - x) + ||x - x_0||$ must attain its maximum at $x = x_0$ by (6.11), but notice that due to the increase of $x \mapsto ||x - x_0||$ the function will strictly increase as x moves away from x_0 along any direction $u \in V_0$ where $\nabla_u(\varphi^{\oplus}(x) + \gamma(x)\cdot(x_0 - x)) \geq 0$ at $x = x_0$, a contradiction. We have shown that if $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} \neq \{x_0\}$ and duality is attained, then:

(6.13) For $c(x,y) = -||x-y||$, $x_0 \notin \operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$ whenever $\varphi^{\oplus}$ is differentiable at x_0.

Next, assume that $c(x,y) = ||x-y||$. The staying property in this case refers to the statement $D_{\#}(\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2) \leq \pi$ as stated in the theorem. This property was proved in, e.g. [5, Theorem 7.4] in one dimensional case and [27, Theorem 2.3] in general dimensions. [5], [27] assumed $c(x,y) = |x-y|$, i.e. the Euclidean distance, but we note that the same proof works for any strictly convex norm distance cost. From the staying property, the study of the geometry of π is now reduced to the study of $\tilde{\pi} := \pi - D_{\#}(\pi^1 \wedge \pi^2)$. Notice that $\tilde{\pi}$ has no mass on the diagonal $\{(x,x) \,|\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ and it solves MMOT problem with respect to its own one-dimensional marginals.

Step 3. In this step, we will show that $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$ is contained in the set of extreme points of $\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0})$. To prove this, first we will show that $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0}$ is contained in the boundary of $\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0})$. Here the boundary refers to the topology of V_0 and not of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that $c(x,y)$ is either $||x-y||$ or $-||x-y||$, but when $c(x,y) = ||x-y||$ we assume that π has no mass on the diagonal without loss of generality by Step 2, hence we assume that π_{x_0} has no mass at $\{x_0\}$.

Now suppose on the contrary that $\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} \nsubseteq \operatorname{bd}\big(\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0})\big)$. Then we can find a point $y \in \operatorname{int}\big(\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0})\big) \cap (\operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} \setminus \{x_0\})$ and in turn we can find a finite subset $\{y_0, y_1, ..., y_m\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\pi_{x_0} \setminus \{x_0, y\}$ such that y is a convex combination of these, i.e.

$$y = \sum_{i=0}^{m} p_i y_i \quad \text{for some} \quad p_i > 0,\ \sum_{i=0}^{m} p_i = 1. \tag{6.14}$$

Then observing that $y \mapsto \nabla_u\gamma(x)\cdot(y-x)$ is linear, from (6.12) we deduce

$$\nabla_u c(x_0, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} p_i \nabla_u c(x_0, y_i) \quad \forall u \in V_0. \tag{6.15}$$

From this, we will show that

(6.16) the points $\{y, y_0, y_1, ..., y_m\}$ lie on a ray emanating from x_0.

To see this, take $u = y - x_0$ and let $c(x,y) = ||x-y||$. Then clearly

$$\nabla_u c(x_0, y) \leq \nabla_u c(x_0, y_i) \quad \forall i = 0, 1, ..., m \tag{6.17}$$

(or if $c(x,y) = -||x-y||$ then the inequality is reversed.) Let $\overline{x_0 y}$ be the infinite line containing x_0, y. We claim that for any $z \notin \overline{x_0 y}$ we have $\nabla_u c(x_0, y) < \nabla_u c(x_0, z)$. If this is true, then by (6.15), (6.17) we conclude that $\{y, y_0, y_1, ..., y_m\} \subseteq \overline{x_0 y}$, and in fact, clearly all of $y, y_0, y_1, ..., y_m$ must lie on one side of the line $\overline{x_0 y}$ with respect to x_0.

Thus to show (6.16) it only remains to show the claim. Recall $u = y - x_0$. Let $z \notin \overline{x_0 y}$ and consider the function

$$\sigma(t) := \big(||z - (x_0 + tu)|| - ||z - x_0||\big) - \big(||y - (x_0 + tu) - ||y - x_0||\big), \quad -1 < t < 1.$$

Then the claim reads as $\sigma'(0) > 0$. Note that $||y - x_0|| - ||y - (x_0 + tu)|| = t||u||$, so

$$\sigma(t) = ||z - (x_0 + tu)|| - ||z - x_0|| + t||u||, \quad -1 < t < 1.$$

Notice that $\sigma(0) = 0$, $\sigma(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $\sigma(t) < 0$ for $t < 0$ since the norm $||\cdot||$ is strictly convex and $z \notin \overline{x_0 y}$ (we note that this is the only place where strict convexity is used). Also notice that σ is convex, hence $\sigma'(0) > 0$. The claim is proved.

Now having (6.16) at hand, we can argue as in [19]: if $\dim V_0 \geq 2$ then notice that we could choose $\{y_0, y_1, ..., y_m\}$ in such a way that they are not aligned meanwhile (6.14) holds. But then (6.16) immediately forces them to be aligned, a contradiction. If $\dim V_0 = 1$ then since π_{x_0} has barycenter at x_0 we could choose y_0, y_1 in the opposite direction with respect to x_0, that is $(y_0 - x_0) \cdot (y_1 - x_0) < 0$. Then again (6.15) cannot hold, a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that $\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0} \subseteq \operatorname{bd}\big(\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0})\big)$.

Finally, if $\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0} \nsubseteq \operatorname{Ext}(\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0}))$, then again we can find $\{y, y_0, y_1, ..., y_m\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0}$ such that (6.14) holds. Then by the above argument we deduce (6.16), a contradiction to the fact that $\{y, y_0, y_1, ..., y_m\} \subseteq \operatorname{bd}\big(\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0})\big)$. Hence we conclude that $\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0} \subseteq \operatorname{Ext}\big(\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{supp} \pi_{x_0})\big)$. By letting $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, this completes the proof of Theorem 6.1 when every (μ_i, ν_i) is an irreducible pair of probability measures.

Step 4. We will establish the theorem when each (μ_i, ν_i) is in convex order but not necessarily irreducible. It is well known that any convex-ordered pair (μ_i, ν_i) can be decomposed as at most countably many irreducible pairs, and the decomposition is uniquely determined by the potential functions u_{μ_i}, u_{ν_i}. More details can be found in [5], [6], and here we restate [6, Proposition 2.3] for convenience.

[$*$] For each $i \in (d)$, let $(I_{i,k})_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ be the open components of the open set $\{u_{\mu_i} < u_{\nu_i}\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$, where $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Let $I_{i,0} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \cup_{k \geq 1} I_{i,k}$ and $\mu_{i,k} = \mu \lfloor_{I_{i,k}}$ for $k \geq 0$, so that $\mu_i = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu_{i,k}$. Then, there exists a unique decomposition $\nu_i = \sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_{i,k}$ such that

$$\mu_{i,0} = \nu_{i,0}, \quad \text{and} \quad (\mu_{i,k}, \nu_{i,k}) \text{ is irreducible with domain } (I_{i,k}, J_{i,k}) \text{ for each } k \geq 1.$$

Moreover, any $\pi_i \in \operatorname{MT}(\mu_i, \nu_i)$ admits a unique decomposition $\pi_i = \sum_{k \geq 0} \pi_{i,k}$ such that $\pi_{i,k} \in \operatorname{MT}(\mu_{i,k}, \nu_{i,k})$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Note that $\pi_{i,0}$ must be the identity transport (i.e. $\pi_{i,0}$ is concentrated on the diagonal $\{(x, x) \,|\, x \in I_{i,0}\}$) since it is a martingale and $\mu_{i,0} = \nu_{i,0}$. There is no randomness in $\pi_{i,0}$. Now for the rest of the proof we will assume that $d = 2$ only to avoid notational difficulty, but we shall observe that the same argument works for general dimensions.

Let π be a minimizer for the problem (1.9) and let $\mu_1 = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu_{1,k}$, $\mu_2 = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu_{2,k}$ be the unique decomposition of μ_1, μ_2 respectively. Then our domain $\mathbb{R}^2$ is decomposed as $\mathbb{R}^2 = \cup_{m \geq 0, n \geq 0} I_{1,m} \times I_{2,n}$ accordingly. Now the strategy is to study the geometry of π on each domain $I_{m,n} := I_{1,m} \times I_{2,n}$.

Let $\pi_{m,n} := \pi \lfloor I_{m,n} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ be the restriction of π on $I_{m,n} \times \mathbb{R}^2$. If $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, then $(\mu_{1,m}, \nu_{1,m})$ and $(\mu_{2,n}, \nu_{2,n})$ are both irreducible and in this case we already established the theorem. On the other extreme, that is if $m = 0$ and $n = 0$, then as mentioned above there is no randomness in $\pi_{0,0}$, that is $\pi_{0,0} \in \operatorname{MT}(\pi^1_{0,0}, \pi^1_{0,0})$ where $\pi^1_{0,0}$ is a coupling of $\mu_{1,0}$ and $\mu_{2,0}$. Hence $\pi_{0,0}$ is concentrated on the diagonal $\{(x, x) \,|\, x \in I_{1,0} \times I_{2,0}\}$, therefore the theorem obviously holds in this case.

The last case is when $m = 0$ and $n \geq 1$. Write $\pi = \pi_{0,n}$ for simplicity and recall that $\pi = \operatorname{Law}(X, Y)$ where $X = (X_1, X_2)$, $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$, and (X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2) are martingales.

Let $\pi_1 = \text{Law}(X_1, Y_1)$ and $\pi_2 = \text{Law}(X_2, Y_2)$, so that π is a joint measure of π_1 and π_2. But since $\mu_{1,0} = \nu_{1,0}$ we have $X_1 = Y_1$, thus the cost is reduced as follows:

$$c(x, y) = ||(x_1, x_2) - (y_1, y_2)|| = ||(0, x_2 - y_2)|| := ||x_2 - y_2||_*$$

where $||\cdot||_*$ is the restriction of the norm $||\cdot||$ on the second coordinate axis in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Hence we have $\mathbb{E}_\pi||X - Y|| = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_2}||X_2 - Y_2||_*$ and this implies that π_2 is a minimizer in $\text{MMT}(\mu_2, \nu_2)$ with respect to $||\cdot||_*$. Now by the irreducibility of (μ_2, ν_2) Step 3 already established the theorem for π_2, hence the theorem also holds for π as π_1 is merely an identity transport. Now we notice that the argument works just as well for arbitrary dimension.

Therefore, we have established that $\text{supp}\,\pi_x \subseteq \text{Ext}\left(\text{conv}(\text{supp}\,\pi_x)\right)$ for $\pi^1 - a.e.\, x$. Finally, it is always true that $\text{Ext}\left(\text{conv}(\text{supp}\,\pi_x)\right) \subseteq \text{supp}\,\pi_x$, and if ν_i's are compactly supported then $\text{supp}\,\pi_x$ is compact hence $\text{conv}(\text{supp}\,\pi_x) = \overline{\text{conv}}(\text{supp}\,\pi_x)$. The proof of Theorem 6.1 is now complete. □

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, B. Kirchheim, and A. Pratelli. Existence of optimal transport maps for crystalline norms. Duke Mathematical Journal., Volume 125, Number 2 (2004) 207-241.

[2] L. Ambrosio and A. Pratelli. Existence and stability results in the L^1 theory of optimal transportation. Optimal transportation and applications. Springer Berlin Heidelberg., Volume 1813 of the series Lecture Notes in Mathematics (2003) 123-160.

[3] M. Beiglböck, A.M.G. Cox, and M. Huesmann. Optimal transport and Skorokhod embedding. Invent. Math., to appear. (2016)

[4] M. Beiglböck, P. Henry-Labordère, and F. Penkner. Model-independent bounds for option prices: A linear programming approach. Finance and Stochastics., 17 (2013) 477-501.

[5] M. Beiglböck and N. Juillet. On a problem of optimal transport under marginal martingale constraints. Ann. Probab., 44(1) (2016) 42-106.

[6] M. Beiglböck, M. Nutz and N. Touzi. Complete duality for martingale optimal transport on the line. Ann. Probab., to appear. (2016)

[7] S. Bianchini and F. Cavalletti. The Monge Problem for Distance Cost in Geodesic Spaces. Comm. Math. Phys., Volume 318, Issue 3 (2013) 615-673.

[8] Y. Brenier. Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. Communications on pure and applied mathematics., Volume 44, Issue 4 (1991) 375-417.

[9] L.A. Caffarelli, M. Feldman, and R. J. McCann. Constructing optimal maps for Monge's transport problem as a limit of strictly convex costs. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 15 (2002) 1-26.

[10] T. Champion and L. De Pascale. The Monge problem for strictly convex norms in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Journal of the European Mathematical Society., 12(6) (2010) 1355-1369.

[11] T. Champion and L. De Pascale. The Monge problem in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Duke Mathematical Journal., Volume 157, Number 3 (2011) 551-572.

[12] G. Choquet. Forme abstraite du théorème de capacitabilité. Ann. Inst. Fourier. Grenoble., 9 (1959) 83–89.

[13] Y. Dolinsky and H.M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport and robust hedging in continuous time. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields., 160 (2014) 391-427.

[14] P. Embrechts. Copulas: A personal view. Journal of Risk and Insurance., 76(3), (2009) 639-650.

[15] L.C. Evans. Partial differential equations and Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer. Current Developments in Mathematics., (1997) International Press.

[16] A. Galichon, P. Henry-Labordère, and N. Touzi. A Stochastic Control Approach to No-Arbitrage Bounds Given Marginals, with an Application to Lookback Options. Annals of Applied Probability., Volume 24, Number 1 (2014) 312-336.

[17] W. Gangbo and R.J. McCann. The geometry of optimal transportation. Acta Math., Volume 177, Issue 2 (1996) 113-161.

[18] C. Genest, M. Gendron, and M. Bourdeau-Brien. The advent of copulas in finance. The European Journal of Finance., 15 (7-8) (2009) 609-618.

[19] N. Ghoussoub, Y-H. Kim, and T. Lim. Structure of optimal martingale transport plans in general dimensions. https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.01806 (2016).

[20] D. Hobson. Robust hedging of the lookback option. Finance and Stochastics., 2 (1998) 329-347.
[21] D. Hobson. The Skorokhod embedding problem and model-independent bounds for option prices. In Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2010, volume 2003 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin (2011) 267-318.
[22] D. Hobson and M. Klimmek. Robust price bounds for the forward starting straddle. Finance and Stochastics., Volume 19, Issue 1 (2014) 189-214.
[23] D. Hobson and A. Neuberger. Robust bounds for forward start options. Mathematical Finance., Volume 22, Issue 1 (2012) 31-56.
[24] L. V. Kantorovich. On the transfer of masses. Dokl. Akad. Nauk., SSSR 37 (1942) 227-229 (Russian).
[25] L. V. Kantorovich. On a problem of Monge. Uspekhi Mat. Nauk., 3 (1948) 225-226.
[26] H. Kellerer. Duality theorems for marginal problems. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete., 67(4) (1984) 399-432.
[27] T. Lim. Optimal martingale transport between radially symmetric marginals in general dimensions. https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.3530 (2016).
[28] X. N. Ma, N. S. Trudinger, and X. J. Wang. Regularity of potential functions of the optimal transportation problem. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 177 (2005) no. 2, 151-183.
[29] G. Monge. Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. Histoire de l'académie Royale des Sciences de Paris, (1781).
[30] J. Obłój. The Skorokhod embedding problem and its offspring Probability Surveys, 1 (2004) 321-392.
[31] A.J. Patton. Copula-based models for financial time series. In Handbook of financial time series, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (2009) 767-785.
[32] R.T. Rockafellar. Characterization of the subdifferentials of convex functions. Pacific J. Math, 17 (1966) 497-510.
[33] L. Rüschendorf. Construction of multivariate distributions with marginals Given. Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics., 37 (1), (1985) 225-233.
[34] V. Strassen. The existence of probability measures with given marginals. Ann. Math. Statist., 36 (1965) 423-439.
[35] V. N. Sudakov. Geometric problems in the theory of infinite-dimensional probability distributions. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., 141 (1979) 1-178.
[36] N. S. Trudinger and X. J. Wang. On strict convexity and continuous differentiability of potential functions in optimal transportation. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 192 (2009) no. 3, 403-418.
[37] C. Villani. Topics in optimal transportation, Volume 58, Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2003).
[38] C. Villani. Optimal Transport. Old and New, Vol. 338, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer (2009).
[39] D. Zaev. On the Monge-Kantorovich problem with additional linear constraints. Mathematical Notes., 98(5-6) (2015) 725-741.

Tongseok Lim: Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK
E-mail address: Tongseok.Lim@maths.ox.ac.uk